

Interfaces between Language and Culture
in Medieval England

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

The Northern World

North Europe and the Baltic c. 400–1700 A.D.
Peoples, Economies and Cultures

Editors

Barbara Crawford (St. Andrews)

David Kirby (London)

Jon-Vidar Sigurdsson (Oslo)

Ingvild Øye (Bergen)

Richard W. Unger (Vancouver)

Piotr Gorecki (University of California at Riverside)

VOLUME 48

Interfaces between Language and Culture in Medieval England

A Festschrift for Matti Kilpiö

Edited by

Alaric Hall, Olga Timofeeva,
Ágnes Kiricsi and Bethany Fox



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

Cover illustration front: St Peter's Church in Wearmouth, Sunderland. Photo taken by Olga Timofeeva, adaptation by Ágnes Kiricsi.

Cover illustration back: Grotesque from the church of St John the Baptist, Adel, Leeds. Photo taken by Alaric Hall, adaptation by Ágnes Kiricsi.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Interfaces between language and culture in medieval England : a festschrift for Matti Kilpiö /edited by Alaric Hall...[et al.].

p. cm. — (The Northern world ; v. 48)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-18011-6 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. English philology—Old English, ca. 450-1150. 2. English philology—Middle English, 1100-1500. 3. Language and culture—England—History—To 1500. 4. Languages in contact—England—History. 5. Latin language, Medieval and modern—England. I. Hall, Alaric. II. Kilpiö, Matti. III. Series.

PE108.K55I53 2010

429—dc22

2009047723

ISSN 1569-1462

ISBN 978 90 04 18011 6

Copyright 2010 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Introduction	vii
<i>Alaric Hall, Olga Timofeeva, Ágnes Kiricsi and Bethany Fox</i>	
Anglo-Latin Bilingualism before 1066: Prospects and Limitations	1
<i>Olga Timofeeva</i>	
Interlinguistic Communication in Bede's <i>Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum</i>	37
<i>Alaric Hall</i>	
<i>Quae non habet intellectum</i> : The Disappearance of Fifth-Foot Spondees from Dactylic Hexameter Verse	81
<i>Seppo Heikkinen</i>	
The Representations of Emotions Connected to Dreams and Visions in Pre-Carolingian Continental and Anglo-Latin narratives	99
<i>Jesse Keskiahho</i>	
The Kirkdale Dedication Inscription and its Latin Models: <i>romanitas</i> in late Anglo-Saxon Yorkshire	139
<i>John Blair</i>	
Linguistic Geography, Demography, and Monastic Community: Scribal Language at Bury St Edmunds	147
<i>Kathryn A. Lowe</i>	
Sense and Sensibility: Old English Semantics and the Lexicographer's Point of View	179
<i>Antonette diPaolo Healey</i>	
Spatial Understanding of Time in early Germanic Cultures: the Evidence of Old English Time Words and Norse Mythology	203
<i>Lilla Kopár</i>	

The Development of the Basic Colour Terms of English	231
<i>Carole P. Biggam</i>	
The Lexicon of Mind and Memory: <i>Mood</i> and <i>Mind</i> in Old and Middle English	267
<i>Ágnes Kiricsi</i>	
Another Subordinator, <i>An't</i> Please You: A Diachronic Study of Conditional <i>And</i>	289
<i>Alexandra Fodor</i>	
Translating Chaucer's Power Play into Modern English and Finnish	307
<i>Mari Pakkala-Weckström</i>	
Index	329

INTRODUCTION

Alaric Hall, Olga Timofeeva, Ágnes Kiricsi and Bethany Fox

These are exciting times for the study of early medieval language. Although the philological tradition from which the discipline of historical linguistics grew has always encouraged the integration of linguistic evidence with literary analysis and wider cultural history, medieval languages as cultural phenomena in their own right have tended to remain the focus only of linguists. However, with the rise during the later twentieth century of cultural history and sociolinguistics, the channels for conversation between those working with historical linguistics and those working with other approaches to the Middle Ages have widened. More recently, in the wake of the explosion of work on early medieval orality (primarily in literary studies) and literacy (primarily in historical studies), language itself is becoming a major focus of attention in medieval studies. The twelve articles in this volume draw on and promote this trend.

The collection, and its celebration of the work of Matti Kilpiö, arises from the editors' experiences as young scholars coming from abroad to study at the University of Helsinki. We were attracted partly by the resources and reputation of Helsinki's Department of English, to which Matti himself has been a key contributor during his long career. But we were drawn especially to Matti's own expertise, represented particularly by his doctoral thesis on the Old English of translations from Latin texts, and his major contribution to the *Dictionary of Old English*, in the form of the entries for *beon* and *habban*.¹ Moreover, Matti's willingness to welcome newcomers to his department—and his talent for doing

¹ Matti Kilpiö, *Passive Constructions in Old English Translations from Latin, With Special Reference to the OE Bede and the Pastoral Care*, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 49 (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 1989); *Dictionary of Old English: BEON. With Attested Spellings by Robert Millar Using Materials Assembled by Haruko Momma* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1992), now most readily found within *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* online, ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey, et al. with web interface by Peter Mielke and Xin Xiang (Toronto: DOE project, 2007), <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>>; the entry for *habban* is forthcoming.

so—has made a key contribution to our enjoyment of our time working at Helsinki. Accordingly, we have gathered contributions which, on the one hand, reflect Matti's work as an especially committed teacher and supervisor, and on the other the range of international contacts which his work has engendered among Anglo-Saxonists.

The articles of this volume in particular reflect two axes in Matti's research: medieval English linguistics and the interrelation in Anglo-Saxon England between Latin and vernacular language and culture. We begin with Latin in Anglo-Saxon England, and the wider historical narratives to which its study can contribute. The scene is set by Olga Timofeeva's survey of evidence for the extent of Latinity in Anglo-Saxon England and for the influence of Latin and Old English upon one another. Problematic though our Domesday data is, it suggests that a fraction of a percent of Anglo-Saxons had any Latin education even in the late eleventh century; but Latin exerted greater influence on Old English than standard work on bilingualism would lead us to expect in such circumstances. Timofeeva explores the character and extent of these influences, addressing code-switching, code-alternation, passive familiarity, negotiation, and the effects of second-language acquisition on Anglo-Saxons' Latin, to provide a map of areas through which future work can continue to explore these themes.

More specific aspects of the Latinity of early medieval Britain, and its relationship with vernacular languages, are addressed by Alaric Hall. Using Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* as his main source, he investigates the multilingual situation in Britain in the seventh and eighth centuries, which he views as a period of ongoing expansion of English and Gaelic at the expense of p-Celtic dialects and, perhaps, of Latin as a vernacular. Hall combines evidence of two sorts, narratives and place-names, to argue that in late-seventh-century Northumbria, English and Irish were viable languages for ecclesiastical meetings, whereas the use of Latin as a medium of spoken communication is less securely attested; speakers of Brittonic probably had to use either one or the other prestigious vernacular to be able to participate in a synod. Although Bede frequently lamented the limited ability of the English to speak Latin, he avoided acknowledging the continuity of British Latinity. Like Timofeeva, he suggests that churchmen in early medieval Britain affected processes of language-maintenance and language-change more strongly than has previously been thought.

Turning to the relationship between Anglo-Latin and the wider Latin-speaking world, Seppo Heikkinen examines the history of the

fifth-foot spondee in dactylic hexameters from the earliest hexameter verse in Greek and Latin to that of Aldhelm and Bede. A spondee (the pairing of two long syllables in one foot) in the fifth foot was a rare phenomenon already in Greek poetry, while Roman poets used it mostly to allude to Greek verse and imagery. In late Antiquity, however, as poetic structures grew more rigid and prosodic changes in Latin more prominent, the fifth-foot spondee began to disappear. Heikkinen's study of three metrical treatises—Aldhelm's *De metris* and *De pedum regulis* and Bede's *De arte metrica*—shows that in Anglo-Latin this poetic device became unacceptable. In Bede's case this is one manifestation of a self-conscious opposition to the flaws of pagan authors—and Heikkinen shows how Bede's dogmatic approach to versification continued to be influential for many generations of poets writing in Latin both in England and on the Continent.

Jesse Keskiäho, meanwhile, looks to the Merovingian context of Anglo-Latin writing, focusing on accounts of dreams and visions, and the roles which emotion plays in them, in English and Continental traditions. While stressing the challenging diversity of responses to emotion in late Antique and early medieval Christian writing, Keskiäho argues that the handling of emotion can be linked to texts' wider theological emphases and the types of religiosity which form their background. In the ascetic tradition of St Anthony, it was implied that a true divine vision would promote emotional tranquility, but in traditions emphasising the power of saints—and particularly their power to reprimand—the power of the true vision to inspire fear was emphasised.

The investigations of the interrelation of English and Latin end, appropriately, with a contribution connecting the early period of Britain's Latin, under the Roman Empire, with eleventh-century literacy: John Blair argues that the famous Kirkdale dedication inscription is partly modelled on similar Roman inscriptions, connecting this with the *romanitas* of the Kirkdale church's impressively developed Romanesque style.

The focus of the collection then shifts to medieval English linguistics, and the evidence which linguistic approaches can provide for understanding medieval culture. Moving from the Latin side of Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical life to monks' vernacular writing, the section begins with Kathryn A. Lowe's examination of the charter evidence of Bury St Edmunds for the East Anglian dialect of Old English. Not only does this provide valuable perspectives on the most poorly attested of the Old English dialects, and an important point of reference for using Middle

English dialect data from the region, but it provides Lowe with a basis for investigating the dialectal evidence for Bury's demographic profile during the Middle Ages.

Matti's semantic studies are represented particularly by Antonette diPaolo Healey, Lilla Kopár and Carole P. Biggam. Healey responds to Matti's major contributions to the *Dictionary of Old English* by discussing a number of the lexicological problems which were tackled in the course of writing the most recent set of entries in the *Dictionary*, for words beginning with *g*. She focuses on the words *gān* 'to go', reflecting on the challenges presented to the lexicographer by high-frequency verbs, the *hapax legomena* *gramfærnys*, which she argues is an error for **grambærnys*, and *sīþgearu*, a poetic compound whose various possible meanings come under new scrutiny.

Kopár, meanwhile, works to integrate semantic evidence from Old English, and other medieval Germanic languages, with textual evidence, particularly from Scandinavian mythological literature, to reconstruct traditional concepts of time in Anglo-Saxon culture. She focuses on the semantic overlaps between words for time and words for space to suggest that these two axes were not always distinct in Anglo-Saxon world views, comparing this evidence with textual evidence for the prominence of the hall as a metaphor for life and the world in both their chronological and spatial forms.

In her semantic study, Biggam provides an insight into the development of basic colour terms, bringing diachronic evidence to bear on the evolutionary sequence suggested by Berlin and Kay in 1969 using comparative evidence from modern languages. Experimenting with the application of diachronic semantics not only to medieval data but distant prehistory, she explains that the development of basic colour terms could have started from the visual perception of objects of vital importance, and as the terms associated with them gradually became independent of the objects themselves, the generic cognitive colour categories came into being. Biggam assesses our linguistic data to propose an order of acquisition for the colour terms from Palaeolithic DARK and LIGHT to Mesolithic MACRO-RED, Proto-Indo-European YELLOW + GREEN, Germanic GREEN and GREY, Old and Middle English BLUE and BROWN, and more recently Modern English PURPLE, ORANGE and PINK.

Two contributors offer diachronic corpus-based studies. Ágnes Kiricsi's is based on the *Helsinki Corpus*, the *Dictionary of Old English*, and the *Middle English Compendium*. It covers the early stages in

the semantic development of two closely related lexemes—*mood* and *mind*—from Old English into Middle English. Kiricsi's study shows how the emotional sense of Old English *mod* ('mind') gradually intensified towards the end of the Middle English period, as the word lost its connotations of rationality. Meanwhile, the Old English word *gemynd* began to develop towards the present-day 'mind', departing from its more prominent original meaning 'memory', which, however, continues to be preserved in collocations. Diatopic analysis of Middle English material shows the northern dialects to have been more conservative semantically than southern ones.

The second corpus study, by Alexandra Fodor, examines the history of the conditional subordinator *and* in prose texts from the mid-twelfth to early eighteenth century, using the *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English* and the *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English*. Fodor's data are divided into subperiods of Middle and Early Modern English and suggest that the peak in the use of conditional *and* was in the late Middle English period. A further distinction is made between several types of conditional clauses. This analysis provides a more fine-grained picture of our standard accounts, presenting detailed diachronic and diatopic data to show the extent to which *and*-conditionals were most frequent grammatically in clause-initial position and diatopically in the West Midlands.

Concluding the chronological progression of the collection, Mari Pakkala-Weckström examines the question of translation versus modernisation in one Finnish and three Modern English renderings of Chaucer's *The Miller's Tale*, *The Merchant's Tale* and *The Shipman's Tale*, opening up an area in the study of Chaucer's reception which has hitherto received almost no attention. She focuses especially on how Chaucer's vividly depicted power-play between men and women is preserved in translation, and the degree to which the translations are true to the original. The study develops the politeness theory of Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson and the impoliteness output strategies of Jonathan Culpeper.

The editing of this volume was facilitated by a grant from the Department of English, University of Helsinki, for which the editors are grateful. We would also like to express our gratitude to the contributors to the volume for their willing (and patient) co-operation, and our hope that the honorand will find this a small, but fitting, tribute to his own scholarship.

ANGLO-LATIN BILINGUALISM BEFORE 1066: PROSPECTS AND LIMITATIONS¹

Olga Timofeeva
University of Helsinki

Introduction

As much as we know about the beginnings of the English language and its indebtedness to medieval Latin culture, little effort has been made to summarize the available data and describe or reassess it in terms of contemporary language contact theory. This may be partly explained by the fact that, studying a language situation that goes as far back as the seventh century AD, with the concomitant lack of statistical data and absence of living native speakers, we are often restricted to hypothesizing and generalizing. However, if we approach the old data from the alternative perspective afforded by a younger discipline, we may be able to get new insights into the historical and linguistic facts of the period. This paper is an attempt to sketch an empirical picture of Anglo-Latin bilingualism before the Norman Conquest and to discuss the practical prospects and limitations of the language contact approach.

The questions that will concern us in this paper are whether the coexistence of English and Latin during the Old English period can be described in terms of language contact, and whether, indeed, it is a language contact situation. The reasons to doubt this are indeed many, for the characteristics of medieval Latinity conflict with many qualitative and quantitative criteria employed in evaluations of language contact today. The first peculiarity to mention here is the lack of oral communication between native speakers of Latin and Old English,

¹ The research reported here was supported by the Academy of Finland Centre of Excellence funding for the Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English at the Department of English, University of Helsinki, and a grant from the Jubilee Fund, University of Helsinki, for 2007. A version of this article was read at the Sixth International Symposium on Bilingualism, Hamburg, Germany (2007). I am grateful to Alaric Hall, Susan Pintzuk, Ann Taylor, and Antony R. Warner for their comments on the draft of the paper.

which was first of all connected with the geographical remoteness of Britain, but also with the fact that even in the Romance-speaking parts of Europe, Latin was becoming an essentially written language, different from the evolving vernacular languages.² Thus, we can assume that literary competence in Latin was perhaps a more widespread phenomenon in medieval England than oral competence, with Latin being used in correspondence and legal documents. The theory of language contact presented in the fundamental work in the field—that of Thomason and Kaufman—warns us that such contact situations should be approached with caution:

In cases like these, if we were to maintain the traditional criterion, “bilingualism” would have to be defined in a way that includes literary competence without oral competence (but we do not in fact recommend such an extension of the meaning of “bilingualism”).³

However, my data will hopefully show that the proximity of native speakers of each language in Anglo-Latin setting was not essential. Rather, a contact situation developed from the acquisition of the second language and its dominant position as means of literary and spiritual communication, in which oral use of Latin eventually became possible: mass, preaching, school instruction and, perhaps to a lesser extent, ordinary conversation among the clergy. It is the influence of the culturally, and hence linguistically, dominant group, with its bilingual and biliterate practises, on common Old English that my article addresses.

² I rely here on the paradigm proposed by Wright for stage A in the development of the Romance languages: in France up to ca. 800 and in Spain up to 1080, one language was used (“Proto-Romance”), which was written in the traditional way, but spoken in different evolving ways in different places (“vernacular”). Thus, Latin was a higher-register written variety of local languages. The need to differentiate between Latin and the vernacular did not seem evident until 813, just a few years after the reform of Latin orthography undertaken by Alcuin and other Carolingian scholars, when the council of Tours coined the term *rustica Romana lingua*. See Roger Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France* (Liverpool: Cairns, 1982), 261–262; Roger Wright, *A Sociophilological Study of Late Latin*, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 9–10 and 95–103; and Tore Janson, “Language Change and Metalinguistic Change: Latin to Romance and Other Cases,” in *Latin and the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Roger Wright (London: Routledge, 1991), 19–28, at 21–22.

³ Sarah G. Thomason and Terrence Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988), 66–67; Sarah G. Thomason, *Language Contact* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001).

The study falls into three main sections. I first describe the historical background for the Anglo-Latin language contact, proceeding to a statistical evaluation of the intensity of this contact based on the evidence of the Domesday Book for the demographic frequency of Anglo-Latin bilinguals. Although analyses of this kind are very difficult, it becomes clear that Latin was more influential on Old English than Thomason and Kaufman's work would lead us to expect from the number of its speakers alone.⁴

The study then proceeds to consider a range of linguistic phenomena that are normally associated with contact situations, in the order in which they are presented in the chapter on mechanisms of contact-induced language change in Thomason, and following Thomason's definitions.⁵

Socio-historical background

Traditionally, three stages of Latin influence (and thus three layers of Latin borrowings) are distinguished within the Old English period: (1) the continental period, before the migration to England, ca. 100 BC ca. AD 450, (2) the early insular period, with Latin influence via Celtic transmission, ca. 450 ca. 600, and (3) the Christian insular period, after ca. 600/650. The loans of the first two periods were introduced via oral communication, mostly pertain to military, household, or trade milieus, and are phonologically closer to Vulgar Latin, while the loans of the third period mostly came from written Classical Latin and supplied English with many learned and ecclesiastical terms.⁶ The second period is the most controversial of the three, for its evaluation depends on our understanding of the linguistic situation in Britain at the time of Anglo-Saxon settlement, and particularly of the degree to which Latin was still a spoken language in England.⁷ Although I recognize

⁴ Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact* and Thomason, *Language Contact*.

⁵ Thomason, *Language Contact*, 129–152.

⁶ See Dieter Kastovsky, "Semantics and Vocabulary," in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, ed. Richard M. Hogg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 1:290–408, at 301–311; and Helmut Gneuss, "Anglicae linguae interpretatio: Language Contact, Lexical Borrowing and Glossing in Anglo-Saxon England," 1992 *Lectures and Memoirs, Proceedings of the British Academy* 82: 107–148, at 112–118.

⁷ The most extreme claims concerning the survival of spoken Latin in early medieval England have been made by Peter Schrijver, "The Rise and Fall of British Latin: Evidence from English and Brittonic," in *The Celtic Roots of English*, ed. Markku

this issue as crucially important, in this paper I shall concentrate on language contact in the historical period.

The first recorded incidents that brought the insular Germanic peoples (primarily the inhabitants of Kent) into contact with speakers of Latin were probably the Roman missions of 597 and 601. Bede reports that the mission of Augustine in 597 consisted of about forty men,⁸ who most probably came from Italy or Gaul.⁹ Many of them, such as Laurence (d. 619), Mellitus (d. 624), Justus (d. 627×631), Honorius (d. 653), Paulinus (d. 644), and Romanus (d. in or before 627) are known by name, for later on they headed bishoprics in Canterbury, York, London, and Rochester, often succeeding each other. More foreigners (e.g., Birinus (died ca. 650) and Felix (died 647/8), who were to become the bishops of the Gewisse and the East Angles, respectively) came to England in the first half of the seventh century to support the Roman mission.¹⁰ All these people were directly involved in the conversion of the English, preaching at the courts of the kings and aristocracy, setting up dioceses, founding monasteries, building churches, and establishing schools. The latter circumstance must have been significant not only for the spiritual instruction of the Anglo-Saxons, but also, and more importantly for our purposes, for the Latin language proficiency of the emerging local clergy. One of the major questions that has to be left untouched here is the role of Irish missionaries in the education of the English clergy and laymen; this omission is due both to considerations of brevity and to my belief that this information is unlikely to make any dramatic changes to the overall picture.¹¹

The first fifty years of English ecclesiastical history produced very few local clerics who would have been educated and influential enough

Filppula, Juhani Klemola and Heli Pitkänen, *Studies in Languages* 37 (Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Humanities, 2002), 87–110; see also Alaric Hall's contribution to this volume, in which he wonders if Latin remained a mother tongue for some people in western England even into the time of Bede.

⁸ "Socii eius, uiri ut ferunt ferme XL," see Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press), i.25.

⁹ Cf. John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 34.

¹⁰ See *HE* ii.15 and iii.7.

¹¹ For references and one of the most recent accounts of the influence of Irish clergy, see Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 10–34, 43–49.

to compete for high positions with these foreigners.¹² However, in 644, following the death of Paulinus, Archbishop Honorius consecrated Ithamar (died ca. 656), a man of Kentish descent, as Bishop of Rochester.¹³ Bede considered Ithamar equal to his predecessors in both holiness and education, although his tone may appear somewhat apologetic: "Honorius archiepiscopus ordinavit Ithamar, oriundum *quidem* de gente Cantuariorum *sed* uita et eruditione antecessoribus suis aequandum" ('Archbishop Honorius consecrated Ithamar, a man of Kentish extraction but the equal of his predecessors in learning and in holiness of life').¹⁴ Eleven years later, in 655, Deusdedit (d. 664), a West Saxon, became the first native archbishop.

Nevertheless, the higher clergy was still very small in number by the time of the consecration of Theodore (602–690) as Archbishop of Canterbury. The shortage of bishops was apparently partly due to the epidemic plague in 664, which devastated many monastic communities in England.¹⁵ The arrival of Theodore in England in 669, and the educational activity he undertook together with Abbot Hadrian (630×637–709) in the last decades of the seventh century, was the next important episode in the history of English Latinity. These two ecclesiastics were not originally from Rome: Theodore was of Greek descent and Hadrian was a Syrian who spoke Latin as his mother tongue.¹⁶ Both of them are described by Bede as scholars of outstanding learning, bilingual in Latin and Greek.¹⁷ They brought more books

¹² Cf. Michael Lapidge, "The Anglo-Latin Background," in *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*, ed. Stanley B. Greenfield and Daniel G. Calder (New York: New York University Press, 1986), 5–37, at 8–9; and Richard Sharpe, "The Naming of Bishop Ithamar," *English Historical Review* 117, no. 473 (2002): 889–894, at 894.

¹³ The name Ithamar derives from the Old Testament (Ex 6:23, 28:1, Nm 3:2). The tradition of giving Hebraic names to priests was persistent among the British clergy, but was almost unknown in Anglo-Saxon sources. This led Sharpe to suggest that Ithamar was a Briton and that Bede suppressed this fact, believing that "the British had failed in their duty to bring their English neighbours to Christ" (see note 12). If Sharpe's conclusion is correct, it pushes forward the consecration of the first English bishop by several years: Thomas of the Gyrwe became bishop of the East Angles in ca. 648, and was succeeded by Berhtgisl (Boniface) of Kent before 653 (*HE* iii.20). However, I am not entirely convinced that Bede's phrasing supports this claim (see quotation above).

¹⁴ See *HE* iii.14, emphasis mine.

¹⁵ Maddicott, J. R., "Plague in Seventh-Century England," *Past and Present* 156 (1997): 7–54.

¹⁶ See Michael Lapidge, "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse," *Comparative Literature* 31, no. 3 (1979): 209–231, at 211.

¹⁷ See *HE* praefatio and iv.1.

to England and instructed the English clergy in the arts of ecclesiastical computus, music and metrics, teaching them Latin and Greek. Schools were set up in Canterbury, York, Whitby, Malmesbury, Lindisfarne, Jarrow and Wearmouth. Even after the members of the Roman mission had died out, there were scholars who could speak fluent Latin: the most renowned among the students of Theodore and Hadrian was Aldhelm (d. 709/710); among the others, Bede names Albinus, Hadrian's successor as abbot of the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul in Canterbury (d. 732); Tobias, Bishop of Rochester (d. 726); and Oftfor, Bishop of Hwicce (d. 699).¹⁸ Among the achievements of Theodore's archiepiscopate were a better administrative division of the dioceses and of authority between bishops and monasteries, the strengthening of the archbishopric in Canterbury, and the foundation of the school of Canterbury, one of the most learned communities in contemporary Europe.¹⁹

Eventually, the high standards of Latinity set by the Roman scholars started to decline, with several social and economic factors contributing to this process: the shifting of royal patronage and the erosion of monastic autonomy, often leading to annexation and redistribution of monastic lands; the general trend of secularization and urbanization of religious life; and the emerging threat of Viking attacks, during which in many regions, especially in the East, monasteries were destroyed, libraries burnt, and clergy massacred.²⁰ The situation became lamentable by the time King Alfred succeeded to the throne of Wessex in 871.²¹ Alfred's account of the state of learning in England at his time

¹⁸ In his preface to the *Ecclesiastical History*, Bede refers to abbot Albinus as a man most learned in everything ("uir per omnia doctissimus," *HE* praefatio), and later on in v.20, Albinus is described as a man who "was so well trained in scriptural studies that he had no small knowledge of the Greek language and that he knew Latin as well as English, his native tongue" (translation by Colgrave and Mynors). Furthermore, Bede says that Albinus was one of his sources for the *History*, and that it was through Albinus's help and encouragement that the whole project saw the light (*HE* praefatio). Similar remarks about the trilinguality and learnedness of Tobias are found in *HE* v.8 and 23. Oftfor's travels to study at Canterbury and Rome are mentioned in *HE* iv.23.

¹⁹ F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 130–143, 180–83; Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 79–80, 91–92.

²⁰ These factors are discussed at length by Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 291–341.

²¹ Cf. Susan Kelly, "Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word," in *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 36–62, at 53.

is well known.²² His statement is also supported by documentary evidence: Latin charters from the second half of the ninth century display “appalling ignorance of Latin orthography and grammar.”²³ Moreover, as Gneuss was able to show, book production in the ninth century fell dramatically: “only ten manuscripts...can be considered as products of Anglo-Saxon scriptoria in the ninth century before Alfred,” compared to 131 manuscripts written before the beginning of the ninth century.²⁴

To remedy this situation, King Alfred established a school for young noblemen at Winchester in the 870s and invited a number of learned foreigners to his court to advise him on his policy of spiritual education in England, a tradition continued by Alfred’s son and grandson and their successors. Several important books were translated from Latin into English as part of Alfred’s educational programme. Although the canon of Alfredian translations continues to be disputed,²⁵ more important for our purposes than the actual translator of such texts as the *Pastoral Care* and the *Consolation of Philosophy* is that they were associated with the court of Alfred, and through this association maintained authority during the late Old English period. The idea that Alfred’s policies had a long-lasting effect on the development of scholarship is supported by the fact that many Alfredian translations from Latin were subsequently copied and recopied, and that the standard of common Latin documents such as charters began to improve.²⁶

If Alfredian times can be described as the period of emancipation of English through the translation of books that were “the most important for everyone to know,” the texts of the late Old English period show that the cultural gap between Latin and English continued to

²² See Alfred, *King Alfred’s West-Saxon Version of Gregory’s Pastoral Care*, ed. Henry Sweet, Early English Text Society 45 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1871, reprinted 1958), 2–9.

²³ Michael Lapidge, “Schools, Learning and Literature in Tenth-Century England,” in *Anglo-Latin Literature 900–1066* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1993), 1–48, at 5–6; cf. Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 128.

²⁴ Helmut Gneuss, “King Alfred and the History of Anglo-Saxon Libraries,” in *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature, Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*, ed. Ph. R. Brown, G. R. Crampton, and Fred C. Robinson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 29–49, at 36–38.

²⁵ See references and editions of Alfredian translations in, e.g., Malcolm Godden, “Wærferth and King Alfred: The Fate of the Old English *Dialogues*,” in *Alfred the Wise, Studies in Honour of Janet Bately*, ed. Jane Roberts and Janet L. Nelson, with Malcolm Godden (Cambridge: Brewer, 1997), 35–51.

²⁶ Lapidge, “Schools, Learning and Literature,” 10–12.

become slightly narrower.²⁷ This was the time when the West Saxon written standard spread eastwards to gradually include London and Canterbury and northwards up to the river Severn. The language became standardized, in that new documents were written in West Saxon and old ones copied in such a way that features from other dialects were replaced by those more common in West Saxon.²⁸ The prose language was more regular in its grammar and syntax and stylistically more varied, with authors such as Abbot Ælfric of Eynsham (ca. 950–ca. 1010) and Archbishop Wulfstan of York (d. 1023) employing Latin rhetorical devices in English as well as developing distinctive rhythmical patterns.²⁹ The tenth century was also a time marked by the rise of the Anglo-Saxon square minuscule, a distinctive type of English insular script, and the heyday of the learned style in insular Latin literature, which Alistair Campbell and later Michael Lapidge describe as *hermeneutic*.³⁰

Many of these new developments were associated with the monastic reform in the second half of the tenth century, initiated by Dunstan (d. 988), Archbishop of Canterbury (960–988), Oswald (d. 992), Archbishop of York (972–992), and Æthelwold (904×9–984), Bishop of Winchester (963–984). Although the improvement of education was not the immediate concern of the reformers, their attempt to revive

²⁷ Olga Timofeeva, *Latinskie sintaksicheskie zaimstvovaniia v drevneangliiskomazyke* [Latin Syntactic Borrowings in Old English] (St. Petersburg: Gelikon Plus, 2006), 13–15; cf. also Robert Stanton, *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2002), 144–145. For a recent evaluation of the impact of Alfredian translations on the development of West Saxon as a language of prestige and a very thorough recapitulation of available scholarship on Alfred, see Nicole Guenther Discenza, *The King's English: Strategies of Translation in the Old English Boethius* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005).

²⁸ Cf. Richard M. Hogg's Introduction to *The Cambridge History of the English Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 1:13–14; and Eric G. Stanley, "Linguistic Self-Awareness at Various Times in the History of English from Old English Onwards," in *Lexis and Texts in Early English, Studies presented to Jane Roberts*, ed. by Christian J. Kay and Louise M. Sylvester (Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 2001), 237–253, at 243. For a fuller discussion of the role of West Saxon in late Old English, see Charles L. Wrenn, "'Standard' Old English," in *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1933, 65–88; and Helmut Gneuss, "The Origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's School at Winchester," in *Anglo-Saxon England* 1 (1971): 63–83.

²⁹ Hogg, Introduction to *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, 16–17.

³⁰ Æthelweard, *The Chronicle of Æthelweard*, ed. A. Campbell (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), xlv; Michael Lapidge, "The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature," in *Anglo-Latin Literature 900–1066* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1993), 105–149.

monastic life in England brought about important changes that facilitated better schooling and increased book production. During this period, new monasteries were founded (most notably at Ramsey ca. 970) and old ones were reformed, with secular clergy being replaced with monks and the monastic rule being restricted. Monasteries were supplied with liturgical texts, psalters, gospels-books, and the writings of the Church Fathers; a number of Latin texts were composed, most importantly the *Regularis concordia*, a consuetudinary which gave a complete account of the duties of the monastic life. For authors as Æthelwold and Ælfric, the religious instruction of the lower clergy and even the laity was also a major concern. To this end, Æthelwold translated the Benedictine rule, while Ælfric produced compilations of homilies and saints' lives, along with translations from the Bible.³¹

What has been said in this historical section shows that the language contact situation during the Old English period was by no means stable. In the earlier part of the period, the rises were mostly connected with external cultural injections, while later achievements were part of the process of cultural emancipation, during which inferiority complexes were gradually abandoned and the attitudes of writers towards their vernacular became more conscious. The following sections will deal with sociological and linguistic mechanisms of language contact.

The intensity of language contact

When evaluating the intensity of language contact within a contact situation, we have to keep in mind the following factors: the length of contact, attitudes to language, the degree of familiarity with the second language, and the number of bilingual speakers in the community experiencing language contact.³² Among the linguistic factors related

³¹ Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 445–469; and Dom Thomas Symons, ed. and trans., *Regularis concordia* (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd, 1953), ix–xxviii; Arnold Schröer and Helmut Gneuss eds., *Die angelsächsischen Prosabearbeitungen der Benediktinerregel*, 2nd ed., Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 2 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964); Samuel Crawford, ed., *The Old English Heptateuch*, Early English Text Society o.s. 160 (London: Oxford University Press, 1922).

³² Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact*, 46–53, 66–67, 72.

to contact, the most important is typological relationship between the languages in question.³³

By the end of the Old English period, Latin and English had been in contact for about five hundred years, and some lexical loans can be dated to an even earlier period.³⁴ During these centuries, the language contact situation was developing from diglossia to a state of relatively lesser inequality, in which English started to creep into spheres previously dominated by Latin (e.g., certain legal documents, religious texts addressed to laymen). Since Latin was the native language of almost nobody in England, its usage normally lacked an ethnic dimension,³⁵ and therefore ethnic conflict, a potentially serious component of language contact, was not at work there. In other words, ethnic concerns did not hinder language contact. Thus, it seems that both the length and the nature of contact were favourable for the interference between Latin and English.

Typologically, the two languages belong to different branches of the Indo-European family. Their nominal paradigms have many common features, but the tendency towards morphological simplification and the development of periphrastic structures in English appeared very early: the number of discrete case endings is already low in Old English, especially in the plural.³⁶ The verbal systems of the two languages differ immensely, most notably in tense paradigms and non-finite forms: Latin has twenty-five tenses (including voice and mood distinctions), compared to the Old English five, and thirteen non-finite forms, compared to the Old English three.³⁷ Moreover, as a literary language, Latin is about a thousand years older than English, so that by the seventh century AD, morphological differences between the two languages were intensified by aspects of style, genre, rhetoric, and so on. Had it not been for the high status of Latin in the medieval Christian world, all these factors could have been serious obstacles to language contact. However, the prestige of Latin literacy and its

³³ Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems* (The Hague: Mouton, 1953, reprinted 1974), 3–5; Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact*, 14–20, 53–57, 72–74; Thomason, *Language Contact*, 70–71.

³⁴ Gneuss, “*Anglicae linguae interpretation*,” 112–117.

³⁵ But see Hall in this volume.

³⁶ See Richard M. Hogg, “Phonology and Morphology,” in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, ed. Richard M. Hogg, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 1:67–167, at 122.

³⁷ Timofeeva, *Latinskie sintaksicheskie zaimstvovaniia*, 45–48.

importance in matters of church and law meant that Old English writers borrowed eagerly from Latin, in terms of both grammatical structures and stylistic devices.

The degree of familiarity with Latin differed greatly both between and within social groups. Most of the laity had no direct contact with Latin, although passive knowledge of a few Latin words must have been quite common. There were literate people among the aristocracy, and hence some aristocrats must have had contact with Latin at least through reading.³⁸ The most notable example of a layman who produced his own text in Latin is perhaps that of Ælfric's patron Æthelweard, who composed an adaptation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and addressed it to his relative, Abbess Matilda of Essen.³⁹

The Latin proficiency of parish priests was not equal to that of the higher clergy and monks. Literacy in Latin was essential for an ecclesiastical career, and it is hardly surprising that the major Anglo-Saxon writers (both those writing only in Latin, such as Aldhelm, Bede, Alcuin, etc., and bilingual authors, such as Æthelwold, Ælfric, Wulfstan, etc.) held high positions within the Church, such as abbot, bishop, and archbishop. The regular clergy (i.e., monks) were involved in book production and the copying and glossing of manuscripts in both Latin and the vernacular, so for them, too, the *trivium* was a passport to monastic libraries and scriptoria.

However, the education of the lower secular clergy must have been less profound. The poor knowledge of Latin among priests became a topos in Anglo-Saxon writings. The information that Bede records around 734 in the *Letter to Ecgberht* is then repeated by Alfred in his preface to the *Pastoral Care* and by Ælfric in the *First Old English Letter for Wulfstan* in 1006.

Quod non solum de laicis, id est, in populari adhuc vita constitutis, verum etiam de clericis sive monachis qui Latinae sunt linguae expertes fieri oportet... ipse multis saepe sacerdotibus idiotis haec utraque, et symbolum videlicet, et Dominicam orationem in linguam Anglorum translatam obtuli

[And this should be done, not only as touching the laity, that is to say, them which are still established in the life of the world, but also as touching

³⁸ J. D. A. Ogilvy, *Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (670–804)*, Studies and Documents 2 (Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1936), 105; and Kelly, "Anglo-Saxon Lay Society," 36–62.

³⁹ Æthelweard, *Chronicle of Æthelweard*.

the clergy or monks which are ignorant of the Latin tongue.... I have myself too oftentimes given to unlearned priests both these things, to wit, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer translated into the English tongue]⁴⁰

Swæ clæne hio wæs oðfeallenu on Angelcynne ðæt swiðe feawa wæron behionan Humbre ðe hiora ðeninga cuðen understandan on Englisc, oððe furðum an ærendgewrit of Lædene on Englisc areccean; & ic wene ðæt[te] noht monige begiondan Humbre næren⁴¹

[It [learning] had declined so thoroughly in England that there were very few on this side of the Humber who could understand their services in English, or even translate a letter from Latin into English, and I believe that there were not many beyond the Humber]

Vs bisceopum gedafenað, þæt we þa boclican lare þe ure canon us tæcð and eac seo Cristes boc, eow preostum geopenigan on engliscum gereorde; forþon-þe ge ealle ne cunnon þæt leden under-standan⁴²

[It is fitting for us, bishops, that we open to you, priests, in the English language the book-lore that our canon and also the Christ's book prescribe to us; as not all of you can understand Latin].

Even though these three quotations may contain a degree of rhetorical exaggeration, it is clear that at least some of the lower clergy were not literate in Latin, let alone bilingual.⁴³

The overall number of bilingual speakers

As far as I can tell, there has been no attempt to evaluate the Anglo-Latin contact of the pre-Conquest period statistically, which is hardly surprising, as the demographic data from this period is very fragmentary. The most extensive source of information about the British population of this time is the so-called Domesday Book, a unique demographic survey conducted at the command of William the Conqueror in 1086, twenty years after the Norman Conquest. The Domesday Book lists some 275,000 tenants. To obtain the total popu-

⁴⁰ Bede, *Venerabilis Baedae Epistola ad Ecgbertum Antistitem*, in *Baedae Opera Historica*, vol. 2, ed. and trans. J. E. King (London: Heinemann, 1930, reprinted 1963), ch. 5. The translation follows the same edition.

⁴¹ Alfred, *Gregory's Pastoral Care*, 3.

⁴² Ælfric, *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, ed. and trans. Bernhard Fehr, *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa* 9 (Hamburg: Verlag von Henri Grand, 1914), 68.

⁴³ Cf. Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 492.

lation, this figure should be multiplied by an estimate of the number of people per household. Depending on this estimate, the population has been calculated to be between 1,100,000 (Russell's estimate) and 1,375,000 people (Maitland's estimate).⁴⁴ However, more recent studies suggest that allowances should be made for "unrecorded sub-tenants, and landless men, and for other omissions by the commissioners," and higher estimates should be given for the four northern counties (Cumberland, Durham, Westmoreland, and Northumberland) and two major cities (London and Winchester) which were omitted from the survey. When combined with the previous figures, this produces a range from 1,750,000 to 2,250,000 people.⁴⁵ The next question is how many among those were literate and/or had contact with Latin?

The spheres of life that required literacy at various levels were the church, education, legal transactions and, to a certain extent, the court. However, all these spheres were dominated by one and the same class of people, namely the clergy. Education was only available in monastic and cathedral schools, which generally presupposed that their students would become either monks or secular priests. Even documents with secular applications, such as law codes, charters, wills, and so on, were composed and certified by the clerics, whether written in Latin or the vernacular. Therefore, the clergy was more likely to acquire literacy than any other social group. With Latin grammar being the first subject in the medieval *trivium*, literacy in this context inevitably means at least basic familiarity with Latin.⁴⁶

The approximate size of the clergy in late eleventh century can also be deduced from the Domesday records. The figures for secular clergy are based on the average ratio of individuals to priests or churches, which relies on extending the data about the number of priests and churches which is available for several counties to the counties that lack similar records. These calculations yield a figure of between 3,860 and 4,300 priests. If these figures are compared to the number of

⁴⁴ Josiah Cox Russell, *British Medieval Population* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1948), 54; Frederic William Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897, reprinted 1907), 437.

⁴⁵ John Hatcher, *Plague, Population and the English Economy 1348–1530*, Studies in Economic and Social History (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1977), 68; Edward Miller and John Hatcher, *Medieval England—Rural Society and Economic Change 1086–1348*, Social and Economic History of England (London and New York: Longman, 1978), 28–29.

⁴⁶ Cf. Lapidge, "The Anglo-Latin Background," 5.

Table 1. The estimate of the number of the clergy at the time of Domesday

Regular clergy, monks	740
Regular clergy, nuns	200
Secular clergy	4,000
Higher secular clergy (bishops, their retinues, and cathedral clergy)	60
Lesser secular clergy (deacons, subdeacons, and clerks)	500
Total	5,500

churches consecrated before the Conquest, with the assumption that each church had a priest, we again arrive at a number close to 4,000 priests. Estimates of the number of higher and lower ranks of secular clergy are added to these figures.⁴⁷ Russell's estimate for the number of regular clergy gives a figure of about 1,000; his calculations are based on the following:

We may conjecture that at the time of the Conquest about twenty four of the larger houses had about twenty monks apiece and that twenty six minor houses had an average of ten.⁴⁸

The calculation of the number of nuns is based on a similar principle. The absolute figures for the clerical population are given in Table 1.⁴⁹

It is not possible to say how many people among the laity could read or write in either English or Latin or both, although there are a number of accounts of literate laymen in the surviving literature, King Alfred obviously being the most famous example.⁵⁰ This figure cannot have been very high, since education was limited to ecclesiastical institutions and only a few people could afford and/or appreciate teachers from the holy orders. The total number of literate people would probably not have been more than 6,000 at the time of Domesday, which amounts to between 0.27 and 0.55 percent of population, depending

⁴⁷ Russell, *British Medieval Population*, 42–45, 52.

⁴⁸ Josiah Cox Russell, "The Clerical Population of Medieval England," *Traditio* 2 (1944): 177–212, at 185; the names of the nunneries are listed on p. 179, and the monasteries on p. 185 n. 18.

⁴⁹ Based on Russell, *British Medieval Population*, 52. See also John S. Moore, "'Quot homines?' The Population of Domesday England," in *Anglo-Norman Studies XIX: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1996*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997), 307–334; cf. his figures for the clergy (p. 329) and the total population (pp. 333–334).

⁵⁰ For other names see, e.g., Ogilvy, *Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers*, 105.

on whether we accept Russell's estimate of the population size or the higher figure proposed by Miller and Hatcher; this is equal to one literate person per 183–375 people. However, for the eleventh-century English cultural situation, it would perhaps be more appropriate for us to make a comparison between the literate population and population of free adult males. This can be assumed to be the same as the number of tenants in the Domesday Book (275,000). The percentage of literacy among this group is then 2.18 or one literate person per 46 people, which is still within the margin of statistical error. Furthermore, we have to keep in mind that by 1086 there may already have been as many as 1,000 non-English (Norman, French and perhaps Italian) clerics in England,⁵¹ and that the above figures, recording the situation during the late Old English period, when England was divided into fifteen bishoprics with more or less stable numbers of clergy,⁵² would almost certainly be too high for, say, the year 886, during the reign of Alfred.

These results show how small the proportion of learned people was and how relative our knowledge of Old English is, if some 98–99.5 percent of the population left no record of their language. The general proportion of people who could leave a record might be even smaller, if we consider the fact that ability to read did not necessarily imply ability to write in this period. However, in monasteries or religious centres such as Canterbury, York, or Winchester, that facilitated concentrations of literate people and concomitantly reduced their contact with the rest of the population, levels of literacy must have been very high.

By the standards of language contact theory,⁵³ 0.27–0.55 percent of the population is a negligible group of people that cannot affect the language situation to any serious degree. Low intensity of language contact results in a small number of lexical borrowings, generally nouns belonging to non-basic vocabulary. On the one hand, the Old English data seem to support this scenario, for we know that insular borrowings from Latin after ca. 600/650 only account for some 150 lexical items.⁵⁴ On the other hand, these 0.27–0.55 percent clearly

⁵¹ Josiah Cox Russell, "Demographic Aspects of the Norman Conquest," in *Medieval Demography*, with a preface by David Herlihy (New York: AMS Press, 1987), 125–147, at 137.

⁵² Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 658–660.

⁵³ Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact*, 47–48, 74–78.

⁵⁴ Barbara M. H. Strang, *A History of English*, (London: Methuen, 1970), 314; Dieter Kastovsky, "Semantics and Vocabulary," 307.

belonged to the intellectual elite of Anglo-Saxon society, who, among other things, could exert great influence on contemporary language policies:⁵⁵ take, for example, the Alfredian revival of the late ninth century, or the spread of the West Saxon grapholect in the late Old English period. Furthermore, the Middle English situation shows us that the percentage of bilingual people is not always a decisive factor. According to various estimates, the number of Norman and French settlers in England after 1066 was between 11,000 and 65,000 people,⁵⁶ i.e. 1–5.9 percent (if we accept Russell's estimates of the total population) or 0.49–2.89 percent (if we accept Miller and Hatcher's) of the overall population, which is too small a group to exert cultural pressure.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, the dominant position of this minority and its eventual shift to English once again had a crucial impact on the development of the English language. It seems, then, that what may really matter in hierarchical language situations is not so much the relative number of bilingual individuals, but the social status and authority of the bilingual group.

Having established that the intensity of Anglo-Latin language contact before 1066 was very low by traditional standards, let us now consider several language phenomena that are normally associated with contact situations. The order of the following sections will be based on that presented in the chapter on mechanisms of contact-induced language change in Thomason's *Language Contact*. For definitions of individual mechanisms, I shall rely on the same volume.⁵⁸

Mechanisms of Anglo-Latin language contact

Code-switching

Code-switching is defined by Thomason as the use of material from two languages by a single speaker in the same conversation.⁵⁹ Many Old English texts contain examples of switches into Latin and, although

⁵⁵ Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 91.

⁵⁶ Russell, "Demographic Aspects," 136–137.

⁵⁷ The traditional opinion holds that "cultural pressure is most obviously exerted by a politically and numerically dominant group of population living within its sphere of dominance;" see Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact*, 67.

⁵⁸ Thomason, *Language Contact*, 129–152.

⁵⁹ Thomason, *Language Contact*, 132.

there are very few accounts of aural code-switching in the texts of the period, the written evidence gives us some idea of what this might have been like and in what situations it occurred. The late tenth-century gloss to the *Rushworth Gospels*⁶⁰ includes a bilingual colophon at the end of Matthew:

Farman presbyter þas boc gleosede *dimittet ei dominus omnia peccata sua si fieri potest apud deum*⁶¹

[Farman the priest glossed this book, *may the Lord forgive him all his sins before God if it be possible*].

This switch takes place at the boundary of two clauses and can therefore be called intersentential. The Mercian part of the colophon is not well paralleled and so seems spontaneous, whereas the Latin clause has many close parallels in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, which Farman was glossing; *si fieri potest* is a set phrase in Latin.⁶²

The so-called colophon of Aldred on f. 259r at the end of John in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*⁶³ contains several switches between Latin and Old English, one of them being:

7 [ic] Aldred presbyter *indignus* 7 *misserrimus*? mið godes fultvmme 7 sancti cuðberhtes hit oferglōesade ón englisc⁶⁴

[and [I] Aldred, *unworthy and most miserable* priest, with the help of God and St. Cuthbert glossed this above [the lines] in English].

⁶⁰ Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS D.2.19.

⁶¹ This colophon and the second one by a scribe called Owun, a monolingual colophon in the Northumbrian dialect, are discussed in no. 292 of Neil R. Ker's *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957). In Skeat's edition, the Farman colophon is printed on page 245 of *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1871–1887). Here and later in the text, I use italics for switches into Latin and bold face for the occasional switches into Greek.

⁶² See *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. "possum," 1c; cf. also Mc 13:22 and Rm 12:18 in the Vulgate.

⁶³ London, British Library, London, Cotton MS Nero D.IV.

⁶⁴ The quotation is based on Michelle P. Brown's transcription in *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Society, Spirituality and the Scribe*, The British Library Studies in Medieval Culture (London: The British Library, 2003) 102–103. See also Florence Elizabeth Harmer, *Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), no. 22; Eric George Millar's facsimile of f. 259r in *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Three Plates in Colour and Thirty-Six in Monochrome from Cotton MS. Nero D. IV in the British Museum* (London: The British Museum, 1923), plate xxxvi and transcription on p. 3; and Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 165.

This time, the switch into Latin is intrasentential, yet the phrase itself sounds like a quotation from a prayer.⁶⁵ Although I was unable to discover its immediate source, searches in the *Dictionary of Old English*⁶⁶ revealed that similar humility formulae are repeatedly used in prayers: *ego miser et fragilis* (ArPrGl 1.38.10 and 38.22), *ego indignus et peccator* (ArPrGl 1.44.1), *me indignum et miserum* (ArPrGl 1.1.6), and *ego miser et peccator* (Charm 7.7).

Numerous examples of code-switching can be found in Old English charters, that is, legal documents recording a grant or lease of land or privileges to individuals or institutions.⁶⁷ In English charters, switches into Latin display the same formulaic character as in the colophons just cited, while switches into Old English in Latin charters predominantly occur with place-names, landmarks, and boundaries. These places were known locally, and hence their identification was much easier if they were written in the native language.

In the text of Ælfric's *Grammar*, code-switching is constantly used for pedagogical explanatory purposes. As Joyce Hill has argued, Ælfric's *Grammar* rests on pedagogical traditions established by his teacher Æthelwold.⁶⁸ It can therefore to an extent be used to show how the vernacular could have been employed alongside Latin in a medieval classroom. Compare the following passage from the *Vita Æthelwoldi*:

Dulce namque erat ei adolescentes et iuuenes semper docere, et Latinos libros Anglice eis soluere, et regulas grammaticae artis ac metricae rationis tradere, et iocundis alloquiis ad meliora hortari

[It was always agreeable to him [Æthelwold] to teach young men and the more mature students, translating Latin texts into English for them, passing on the rules of grammar and metric, and encouraging them to do better by cheerful words].⁶⁹

⁶⁵ I am grateful to Anthony Warner for drawing my attention to the formulaic aspect of the Latin sections in these two colophons.

⁶⁶ Antonette diPaolo Healey, ed., *The Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), <<http://ets.umd.umich.edu/o/oec/>>.

⁶⁷ Herbert Schendl, "Hec sunt prata to wassingwellan": Aspects of Code-Switching in Old English Charters," *VIEWS* 13, no. 2 (2004): 52–68, at 54.

⁶⁸ Joyce Hill, "Learning Latin in Anglo-Saxon England: Traditions, Texts and Techniques," in *Learning and Literacy in Medieval England and Abroad*, ed. Sarah Rees Jones, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 3 (Utrecht: Brepols, 2003), 7–29, at 15.

⁶⁹ Wulfstan of Winchester, *The Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. and trans. Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 46–49, quoted in Hill, "Learning Latin," 16.

And here Ælfric employs a similar method to explain the gender of Latin participles:

*Des participiwm is ðreora cynna: hic amans uir þes lufiendra wer; haec amans femina þis lufiende wif; hoc amans mancipium þes lufiendra þeowa man; et cetera*⁷⁰

[the *participle* has three genders: *hic amans uir*, this loving man; *haec amans femina*, this loving woman; *hoc amans mancipium*, this loving slave; *et cetera*].

The switches into Latin in Ælfric's *Grammar* are mostly grammatical terms and examples of particular language rules,⁷¹ but occasionally also discourse markers, such as *et cetera*, above. Although Ælfric glosses the term *participium* as *dæl nimend*, ('the part-taking') when he introduces it earlier on in the same chapter, explaining that [*h*]e *nymð anne dæl of naman and oðerne of worde* ('it takes one part from the noun and the other from the verb'), he later abandons the gloss in favour of the Latin term, which perhaps sounded more accurate to him.

Finally, code-switching was used as a deliberate artistic device in poetry. This genre is traditionally called macaronic.⁷² In two Old English poems—*A Summons to Prayer*⁷³ and the final eleven lines of the *Phoenix*⁷⁴—the switches into Latin are used regularly to separate the second half-line from the first one.

⁷⁰ Ælfric, *Grammatik und Glossar*, ed. Julius Zupitza, Sammlung englischer Denkmäler 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1880), 10.

⁷¹ It might be difficult to classify Ælfric's Latin examples as code-switching, but so long as we adhere to a rather broad definition of code-switching given in the beginning of this section, it should not be a problem.

⁷² The poetic texts discussed in this section have enjoyed the continuous attention of scholars. I hope to contribute to this discussion by concentrating on the linguistic aspects of their bilinguality.

⁷³ On the basis of text and manuscript evidence, Fred C. Robinson has argued that *A Summons to Prayer* is not an independent poem, but a coda to *An Exhortation to Christian Living*, which immediately precedes it in the single extant manuscript, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 201; see "'The Rewards of Piety': 'Two' Old English Poems in Their Manuscript Context," *The Editing of Old English* (Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994), 180–195, at 180–187. He edited the two texts together under the title "The Rewards of Piety," the text of *A Summons* starting at line 82 (pp. 188–195).

⁷⁴ *The Phoenix*, ed. N. F. Blake (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1964), 63, ll. 667–677. If Robinson's conclusion is correct (see note 71), the two poems follow the same pattern—a poem in the vernacular concluded with a flamboyant macaronic coda.

Geunne þe on life	<i>auctor pacis</i>
sibbe gesælða,	<i>salus mundi,</i>
metod se mæra	<i>magna uirtute,</i>
and se soðfæsta	<i>summi filius</i>
fo on fultum,	<i>factor cosmic...</i> ⁷⁵

[May grant you in life *the giver of grace*
 with joys of peace, *the salvation of the world*,
 the eminent lord of *great virtue*,
 and the righteous *son of the highest*
 may take [you] into [his] protection *the maker of the universe...*]

The switches of this poem are intrasentential, yet again the Latin phrases are not created from scratch, but are attested in prayer and hymn texts of the period.⁷⁶ Moreover, many of them can be removed from the text without seriously affecting its general content. This means that they are not fully integrated into the syntax of the Old English poem, and their function in the text is mainly decorative. The pattern of code-switching in the *Phoenix* is very similar.⁷⁷ Another poetic device employed here is, of course, alliteration, on which more below.

Even more elaborate are the switches in the so-called *Aldhelm* poem, a kind of metrical preface to Aldhelm's prose work *De virginitate*, written in tenth-century Canterbury.

Pus me gesette	<i>sanctus et iustus</i>
beorn boca gleaw,	<i>bonus auctor,</i>
Ealdelm, æpele sceop,	<i>etiam fuit</i>
ipselos on æðele	Angolsexna,
byscop on Bretene.	Biblos ic nu sceal,
ponus et pondus	<i>pleno cum sensu,</i>
geonges geanoðe	<i>geomres iamiamque,</i>
secgan soð...	⁷⁸

[thus composed me a *saintly and righteous*
 man learned in books, *a good author*
 Aldhelm, a noble poet, *also he was*
eminent in the land of the Anglo-Saxons,

⁷⁵ Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 6 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), 69, lines 5–9.

⁷⁶ E.g., *auctor pacis* is attested in several versions of the Missals of insular origin; see E. Moeller, J.-M. Clément, and B. Coppeters 't Wallant, eds., *Corpus orationum*, vol. 2, *Corpus christianorum*, Series Latina 160A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1993), no. 1110.

⁷⁷ For a short discussion of the coda of this poem, see Lapidge, "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry," 219.

⁷⁸ Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, 97, lines 1–8.

a bishop in Britain. Now I, **the book**,
labour and authority, with full sense,
 with lamentation of the troubled youth right now
 must tell truly...]⁷⁹

In this poem, the switches are not bound to the second half-lines, nor to nominal parts of speech. In addition, there are eight switches into Greek. The text is notorious for its ambiguity, and certainly fits well into the tradition of hermeneutic writings of the tenth century. However, the Greek switches are all nouns, mostly inflected incorrectly, and may go back to a glossary which the anonymous poet consulted when he needed an alliterating word.⁸⁰ Although the poet's Latin makes more sense grammatically, appositive phrases, like those in *A Summons to Prayer*, are decorative rather than functional; only a few Latin verb-switches fully become part of the English syntactic structure. As in the previous poem, many Latin phrases and almost all Greek ones can be omitted from the text without serious damage to its overall meaning. Following Dobbie's description, this poem can probably be regarded "simply as an exercise in metrical and linguistic ingenuity,"⁸¹ for which mastery of Greek was hardly necessary, while the necessary level of Latin proficiency could amount to knowing many liturgical texts by heart, without necessarily being able to produce any utterances anew.

Code alternation

Whereas code-switching occurs within a conversation, code alternation is the use of two languages by the same speaker but not within the same conversation.⁸² Oral code alternation must have been a regular practise for the clergy, who said mass in Latin but were supposed to preach in English and certainly used English for daily communication both among themselves and with the laymen. Code alternation in church can be illustrated using the following passage from Ælfric's

⁷⁹ For a recent discussion of the poem, see Christopher Abram, "Aldhelm and the Two Cultures of Anglo-Saxon Poetry," in *Literature Compass* 4, no. 5 (2007): 1354–1377, at 1370–1371. Less literal translations can be found in Robinson, "'The Rewards of Piety,'" 184–185; and in Andy Orchard, *The Poetic Art of Aldhelm*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 8 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 282 n. 105.

⁸⁰ Cf. Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, xci–xcii.

⁸¹ Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, xcii.

⁸² Thomason, *Language Contact*, 136.

letter to Wulfsige (d. 1002), Bishop of Sherborne, in which he urges priests to preach to the parish in English after the mass:

Se mæssepreost sceal secgan sunnandagum and mæssedagum þæs godspelles angyt on englisc þam folce. And be þam pater nostre and be þam credan eac, swa he oftost mage, þam mannum to onbryrdnyse, þat hi cunnon geleafan and heora cristendom gehealdan. Warnige se lareow wið þæt, þe se witega cwæð: *Canes muti non possunt latrare*. þa dumban hundas ne magon beorcan. We sceolon beorcan and bodigan þam læwedum, þe læs hy for larlyste losian sceoldan⁸³

[On Sundays and mass-days the priest should relate the meaning of the Gospel to the people in English, and also concerning the Paternoster and the Creed, as often as he can, to inspire the people to know their faith and hold their Christianity. Let the teacher beware of what the prophet said: *Canes muti non possunt latrare*;⁸⁴ dumb dogs cannot bark. We ought to bark and preach to the unlearned, lest they be lost for lack of learning].

Thus, in a way, good pastors were expected to alternate between languages to provide better instruction on faith to the laity. The letter itself is also a good example of code alternation. It starts with a Latin preface addressed to Bishop Wulfsige, to whose diocese Ælfric's monastery of Cerne belonged, but the body of the letter, dedicated to the responsibilities of the priests and thus also intended to be read by the priests, is written in English. This once again suggests that the level of Latin competence was very different among the higher and lower clergy, while code alternation, to an extent, reflected aspects of the church hierarchy and/or etiquette.

We can also say that, in general, alternation between English and Latin in this setting was very often alternation between higher and lower style, although a few pieces of the vernacular poetry clearly belonged to the higher style, as can be seen in the following passage from Cuthbert's (fl. ca. 770) *Epistola de obitu Bedae*, which includes the famous *Bede's Death Song*:⁸⁵

⁸³ Ælfric, *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, 14.

⁸⁴ Isaiah 56:10.

⁸⁵ Edited and translated in Colgrave and Mynors's edition of the *Ecclesiastical History*, 580–587, at 580–582. Translation follows the same edition. Diglossia during the Anglo-Saxon period can be best illustrated using the quantitative relation between two of the most famous texts of the period: while *Beowulf* has miraculously survived in just one manuscript (R. D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, eds., *Klaeber's Beowulf*, 4th ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), xxv), Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* has come down to us in about 170 copies (Colgrave and Mynors,

Canebat autem sententiam sancti Pauli apostoli dicentis “Horrendum est incidere in manus Dei uiuentis,” et multa alia de sancta scriptura, in quibus nos a somno animae exurgere praecogitando ultimam horam admonebat. In nostra quoque lingua, ut erat doctus in nostris carminibus, dicens de terribili exitu animarum e corpore:

Fore ðæm nedfere	nænig wiorðe
ðonc snottora	ðon him ðearf siæ
to ymbhycgenne	ær his hinionge
hwæt his gastæ	godes oððe yfles
æfter deað dæge	doemed wiorðe. ⁸⁶

[And he used to repeat that sentence from St. Paul, “It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,” and many other verses of Scripture, urging us thereby to awake from the slumber of the soul by thinking in good time of our last hour. And in our own language—for he was familiar with English poetry—speaking of the soul’s dread departure from the body, he would repeat:

Facing that enforced journey, no man can be
More prudent than he has good call to be,
If he consider, before his going hence,
What for his spirit of good hap and of evil
After his day of death shall be determined].

A monastic person such as Bede was so fully immersed in Latin Christian culture that even on his death bed the words of prayer and consolation came to him in Latin rather than in his native Northumbrian, even though one would imagine that in ordinary situations and perhaps during the few days described he would have been using his own language too. Cuthbert, who was Bede’s pupil, goes on to enumerate several occasions within the few days during which his teacher was fading away when Bede recalled words from the Gospels, the Epistles of St. Paul, and St. Ambrose. The only time when he used his native language in a similar situation was indeed his recitation of the poem given above. However, in this instance, too, he was quoting rather than improvising.⁸⁷

xxxix–lxxvi). Although this example may in many ways seem simplistic, it clearly shows a tendency to define the vernacular as the language of less importance.

⁸⁶ For the text of *Bede’s Death Song*, see also Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, 107–108.

⁸⁷ Although the poem is traditionally called *Bede’s Death Song*, and is attributed to Bede in a small group of the later manuscripts of the *HE*, there is no compelling evidence that Bede composed it, nor is it implied in Cuthbert’s text (see George Hardin Brown, *Bede the Venerable* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987), 76–77; Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, 580–581 n. 4).

Written code alternation, an example of which I discussed above, is well attested in the writings of men such as Ælfric, who used English to address his lay patron Æthelweard (d. 998?), but Latin for his correspondence with other ecclesiastics, such as Sigeric (d. 994), Archbishop of Canterbury, or Wulfstan, Archbishop of York.⁸⁸ Wulfstan was a fully biliterate writer himself, and both he and Ælfric are well known as compilers of sermons and homilies in the vernacular as well as Latin works.⁸⁹

The data on code-switching and code alternation seem to be in line with the conclusions concerning Latin proficiency and intensity of contact made earlier on: the higher and regular clergy, as opposed to the lower secular clergy, were most probably bilingual and/or biliterate, with high Latin proficiency and, more importantly, means of language “legislation” and language control.

Passive familiarity

Contact-induced change through passive familiarity occurs when a speaker acquires a feature from a language that s/he understands (at least to some extent) but has never spoken actively at all.⁹⁰ This is a common mechanism of language contact when the majority of the population is not bilingual but nevertheless uses a number of foreign terms that come to the language via the bilingual group. Such terms, as a rule, belong to particular spheres of life or professions (religion, the army, trade, etc.), and are borrowed into a language together with the cultural realia that they signify. It can be argued that this mechanism was mostly characteristic of the secular clergy, who, as we have seen

⁸⁸ For an edition of some of Ælfric's letters, see Ælfric, *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*; and Ælfric, *Ælfric's Prefaces*, ed. Jonathan Wilcox (Durham: Durham Medieval Texts, 1994).

⁸⁹ Wulfstan, *The Homilies of Wulfstan*, ed. Dorothy Bethurum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957); Benjamin Thorpe, ed., *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church: The First Part, Containing the 'Sermones Catholici', or, Homilies of Ælfric*, 2 vols. (London: Ælfric Society, 1844–1846); Ælfric, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series, Text*, ed. Malcolm Godden, Early English Text Society s.s. 5 (London: Oxford University Press, 1979); Ælfric, *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, ed. John C. Pope, Early English Text Society o.s. 259, 260 (London: Oxford University Press, 1967–1968); Ælfric, *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, ed. Walter W. Skeat, 4 vols., Early English Text Society o.s. 76, 82, 94, and 114 (London: Oxford University Press, 1881–1900, reprinted 1966).

⁹⁰ Thomason, *Language Contact*, 139.

above, were only potentially bilingual, but in fact had rather low Latin proficiency.

The following words entered the language at various stages of the Old English period: *minster* (post-classical Latin *monasterium* > vulgar Latin *monisterium* > OE *mynster*), *monk* (post-classical Latin *monachus* > OE *munuc*), *mill* (post-classical Latin *molina* > OE *mylen*), *kitchen* (vulgar Latin *cucina* > OE *cycene*), *tile* (Latin *tegula* > OE *tigule/tigele*), *inch* (Latin *uncia* > OE *ynce*), *cheese* (Latin *caseus* > OE *cyse/cese*).⁹¹ Overcoming the boundaries of their social strata, they have survived to the present day. There is perhaps no way to prove that these words were indeed used by common people of the period, but the very fact they are still in the language, having long ago lost their learned and other professional connotations, seems to support this hypothesis; truly professional terms tend to stick to their social stratum or even disappear from the language. Moreover, words belonging to the spheres of passive familiarity follow Old English declension patterns and can be used as parts of compound words and in derivatives (*mylenhweol*, 'mill-wheel,' *mylenstan*, 'grindstone,' *munuclic*, 'monastic,' *munuchad*, 'monastic orders'). More learned words, on the other hand, often retain their Latin forms or do not spread outside professional context. For instance, the word *pallium*, 'pallium,' is used repeatedly in the *Chronicle* to convey the idea of an archbishop's consecration by the Pope,⁹² but the annalists never employ any form other than *pallium*, even if oblique cases are meant. The word *declinung*, 'declension' (Latin *declinatio*), is more integrated into Old English in terms of morphology (in that the Latin root is followed by the Old English suffix *-ung*), but of the sixty instances of *declinung* recorded by the *Dictionary of Old English*, only one is found outside Ælfric's *Grammar*;⁹³ accordingly, this term did not survive into Middle English, but was later re-borrowed in a more Romanised form,

⁹¹ For a thorough discussion of lexical borrowing, see Kastovsky, "Semantics and Vocabulary," 301–317, and Gneuss, *Anglicae linguae interpretatio*, 112–118.

⁹² There was a distinction between *pallium* and the more secular word *pæll*, 'cloth; robe, cloak,' (modern *pall*), which goes back to the same Latin form. See the *OED*, s.v. "pallium" 1, 2a and "pall" n¹.

⁹³ It is used in the same sense of 'grammatical declension' by Byrhtferth of Ramsey (fl. ca. 986–ca. 1016) in his *Enchiridion*, an introductory manual on ecclesiastical computus, written just about a decade after Ælfric's *Grammar* in ca. 1011; see Byrhtferth, *Enchiridion*, ed. and trans. by Peter S. Baker and Michael Lapidge, Early English Text Society s.s. 15 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

declination, which was then superseded in this grammatical sense by *declension* (according to the *Middle English Dictionary*,⁹⁴ both forms are attested by around the middle of the fifteenth century).⁹⁵

Negotiation

The negotiation mechanism is at work when speakers change their native language to approximate what they believe to be the patterns of another language, often when trying to make sense out of sometimes confusing second-language structures.⁹⁶ This mechanism allows different levels of second-language proficiency and can affect morphology, syntax, and word order of the native language. Most frequently, negotiation occurs in translations from a foreign language into a native one. The results of this mechanism can be seen in glosses and literal translations. The following example is taken from the interlinear glosses to the *Regularis concordia*.

gedonum nocternum cweþon twegen sealmas
Peractis nocturnis dicant duos psalmos⁹⁷

[when the nocturn services are completed, let them say two psalms]

Two features can be pointed out in this example in connection with negotiation: first, the main verb *dicant* is glossed in Old English as *cweþon*. While it is typical for Latin finite forms to be used without personal pronouns, in Old English this is rarely the case. In this particular example, the use of the pronoun *hi*, ‘they,’ would be particularly important, as it is the only way to indicate person in the plural (where personal endings are the same for all three persons). Nevertheless, the glossator chooses not to insert the pronoun, perhaps simply because it is not in the Latin. It is, of course, questionable whether this approach easily allows the reader “to make sense” out of the Latin text. Another feature that the example exhibits is the Latin construction known as the ablative absolute (*Peractis nocturnis*) and its Old English imitation,

⁹⁴ Hans Kurath et al., eds., *Middle English Dictionary* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1952–2001).

⁹⁵ See the *OED*, s.v. “declination” †10 and “declension” II, and the *MED*, s.v. “declinacioun” 3 and “declinson;” cf. also the verbal noun “declining” 6 in the *OED*.

⁹⁶ Thomason, *Language Contact*, 142, 146.

⁹⁷ Lucia Kornexl, ed., *Die Regularis Concordia und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1993), §18.

the dative absolute (*gedonum nocternum*).⁹⁸ This gloss shows how a foreign abbreviated clause is calqued and formally explained using a similar combination of parts of speech (a past participle and a noun agreeing in the dative case). We often find the same technique applied in Old English translations from Latin. The next example is from Wærferth's version of Gregory's *Dialogues*.

Peractis igitur missarum sollemniis⁹⁹
 7 þa gedonum symbelnessum þæra mæssan¹⁰⁰

[and so, after the solemnities of the mass were completed]

The context of this absolute construction (*Peractis sollemniis—gedonum symbelnessum*) is almost identical with that in the previous quotation. A negotiation mechanism is again involved here: the translator gives a calque rendering of the ablative absolute instead of a more idiomatic rendering using, e.g., a temporal clause. Even though his word order is more flexible than that of the gloss, he keeps the Latinate construction, as if he were afraid that its meaning would be changed together with its form.

As Matti Rissanen has argued, discourse markers, such as *is to witenne*, 'it is to be known,' entered Old English under the influence of Latin expressions such as *sciendum est* and *notandum est*.¹⁰¹ The mechanism behind *is to witenne* must also be that of negotiation: to understand a foreign collocation you first have to gloss and explain it by means of your native grammar (thus, the Latin gerundive is rendered by the Old English inflected infinitive, both of which have modal and future connotations). Many more calques must have evolved in

⁹⁸ The origin of the dative absolute in Old English has been repeatedly debated in literature, with one group of scholars describing it as a development of the common Indo-European pattern, and the other believing that the absolute construction was a syntactic calque, modelled on Latin and Greek structures and borrowed into Germanic languages. For further discussion and references, see my monograph *Latinskie sintak-scheskie zaimstvovania* and article "Translating Texts Where *et verborum ordo mysterium est*: Late Old English Idiom vs. *ablativus absolutus*," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 19 (2009): 217–229.

⁹⁹ Adalbert de Vogüé, ed., *Dialogues Grégoire le Grand* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1978), 82.

¹⁰⁰ Hans Hecht, ed., *Bischofs Wærferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*, ed. Hans Hecht, *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa* 5 (Leipzig: Georg H. Wigands Verlag, 1900), 62.

¹⁰¹ Matti Rissanen, "Latin Influence on Old English Idiom: 'To Wit'," in *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. John Walmsley (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 222–241.

Old English in a similar way, which is hardly surprising, as glosses and gloss-translations were often used as textbooks or reference books by people with little experience in Latin. Because these people constantly saw, say, *sciendum est* rendered by *is to witenne*, they gradually became accustomed to the idea that this was in fact the way to express a similar notion in English.

*Second-language acquisition and related mechanisms*¹⁰²

Negotiation is also part of second-language acquisition strategies. When using a foreign language, we tend to fill the gaps in our speech or writing with material from our native language. This is best seen in lexis (especially in phraseology), but may also affect structural elements such as word order. Such gap-filling can be illustrated using examples from Latin writings by Æthelweard (*Chronicle*) and Asser (*Life of King Alfred*). These two authors produce peculiar Latin phrases based on the Old English idiom *wælstowe gewæld ahton*, ‘they held the battlefield/they won,’ well attested in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which was used by both writers as a source for their Latin compositions. To express the same idea, Æthelweard employs *obtinēt uictoriæ locum*, ‘they held the site of the victory,’¹⁰³ which is not exactly word-for-word, but preserves the semantics of the phrase rather faithfully. Asser renders this idiom in a more literal way: *loco funeris dominati sunt* (ch. 5, 18, 33, 35, 36, 40, 42), with *loco funeris* being an almost gloss-like rendering of *wælstowe*, whose etymology goes back to ‘the field/site of corpses,’ hence ‘battlefield.’ It is remarkable that Asser uses this coinage several times in passages that do not depend on a corresponding Old English phrase in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.¹⁰⁴ It is still more remarkable that Asser was a native speaker of Welsh, so the interference here actually involves two foreign languages.

Another expression coined by Æthelweard is *fulciunt arma*,¹⁰⁵ which Campbell translated as “they strengthened their armaments.”

¹⁰² Thomason, *Language Contact*, 146.

¹⁰³ Æthelweard, *Chronicle of Æthelweard*, 31. Æthelweard’s coinage may also be a result of contamination of two Old English expressions: *wælstowe gewæld ahton* and a more literal phrase *namon/hæfdon/ahton sige* ‘they took/possessed victory.’

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Asser, *Life of King Alfred*, ed. William Henry Stevenson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), lxxxiv and 178, note; and Alfred P. Smyth, *The Medieval Life of King Alfred the Great: A Translation and Commentary on the Text Attributed to Asser* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2002), 212.

¹⁰⁵ Æthelweard, *Chronicle of Æthelweard*, 35.

In eodem anno aduectæ sunt classes tyranni Iguuares ab aquilone in terram Anglorum, hiemauerunt inter Orientales Anglos, illicque *fulciunt arma*, equos ascendunt, cum accolis pacem confirmant

[In the same year, the fleets of the tyrant Inwær arrived in the land of the English from the north, and they wintered among the East Angles. And there *they strengthened their armaments*, mounted their horses, and concluded peace with the natives]

This phrase has no parallel in the annal for 866 in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, from which the Latin text originates.¹⁰⁶

and þy ilcan geare cuom micel here on Angel cynnes lond, and winter-setl namon on East Englum, and þær gehorsude wurdon, and hie him friþ wiþ namon

[and in the same year, there came a great army to the land of the English, and they took their winter lodgings among the East Angles, and there they were supplied with horses and made peace with them (the East Angles)]

However, it may derive from an Old English phrase with similar meaning, such as *wæpna wealdan*, ‘to wield weapons,’ which is attested in texts written both before the *Chronicle of Æthelweard—Beowulf* (1509 and 2038)¹⁰⁷ and the *Old English Orosius* (iv.10.103.24)—and shortly after—the *Battle of Maldon* (83, 168, and 272). This idiom clearly belongs to poetic diction, and may have been inserted by Æthelweard into his text to add more life and colour to the warlike episode.¹⁰⁸

A mechanism similar to negotiation is active in Anglo-Latin poetry that employs alliteration. It must rest on the assumption (whether conscious or unconscious) that this poetic device can be used in Latin

¹⁰⁶ Campbell suggests that for the fourth book (quoted here), Æthelweard was using a manuscript of the *Chronicle* that up to the annal for 891 was very close to the Parker manuscript; see Æthelweard, *Chronicle of Æthelweard*, xvii–xviii.

¹⁰⁷ I accept the view that *Beowulf* was written before ca. 750. The argumentation to support this date can be found in Michael Lapidge, “*Beowulf*, Aldhelm, the *Liber Monstrorum* and Wessex,” in *Anglo-Latin Literature 600–899* (London: Hambledon Press, 1996), 271–312; “The Archetype of *Beowulf*,” in *Anglo-Saxon England* 29 (2000): 5–41; R. D. Fulk, *A History of Old English Meter* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1992), 164–168, 348–392; it is summarized in the recent edition of *Beowulf* by R. D. Fulk et al., eds., *Klaeber’s Beowulf*, clxii–clxxx.

¹⁰⁸ In theory, Æthelweard might have used a copy of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* that did contain a similar Old English expression unknown in the surviving copies. For Æthelweard’s sources and other peculiarities of his Latin, see Campbell’s introduction to his edition of the *Chronicle of Æthelweard*. It should be mentioned that all six instances of *wæpna wealdan* have the infinitive as their second element, rather than a preterite form as in **wæpna weoldon* (*hi*).

verse in the same way as in English, thus ignoring the obvious differences of stress, rhythmical and metrical patterns between the two languages. Aldhelm's *Carmen de virginitate* opens with the following alliterating lines:

Omnipotens **g**enitor mundum **d**icione **g**ubernans,
 Lucida stelligeri qui **c**ondis **c**ulmina **c**aeli,
 Necnon telluris **f**ormans **f**undamina **v**erbo,
 Pallida **p**urpureo **p**ingis qui flore **v**irecta...¹⁰⁹

[Almighty Progenitor, guiding the world by Your rule,
 Who are the Creator of the shining heights of the star-filled heaven,
 (Who) also formed the foundations of the earth by Your word;
 You Who paint the pale greensward with purple blossom...]¹¹⁰

It may even be argued that in line three, *formans fundamina* alliterates with *verbo*, for Old English did not distinguish between voiceless and voiced labiodental fricatives in the initial position.¹¹¹ The alliteration of the initial consonants could suggest two things: either the Anglo-Saxons stressed alliterating words on the first syllable (as in Old English this was the main stress pattern), which was unlikely to happen in hexameter simply because it would ruin the metre, or such alliterating patterns were actually blunders on the part of Anglo-Latin poets, as due to the differences between Latin and Old English stress and metre, alliteration here could not work in the way the poets expected it to work.¹¹²

The *Carmen ad Deum* uses different metre (trochaic dimetre), with short, mostly two-syllable words, and stress on the first syllable of the foot, and its alliteration pattern is therefore more convincing than the one employed by Aldhelm and his students:

¹⁰⁹ Aldhelm, *Opera*, ed. Rudolf Ehwald, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 15 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1919, reprinted 1961), 352.

¹¹⁰ Translation by James L. Rosier (Aldhelm, *The Poetic Works*, trans. by Michael Lapidge and James L. Rosier, with an appendix by Neil Wright (Cambridge: Brewer, 1985)); capitalization by Rosier, line division mine. On what might be considered alliteration in Aldhelm's hexameters and on types of alliteration in Aldhelm, see Lapidge, "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry," 219–223.

¹¹¹ Lapidge, "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry," 220.

¹¹² Cf. Abram, "Aldhelm and the Two Cultures," 1362–1364. For a discussion of Anglo-Latin hexameter, see Seppo Heikkinen's contribution to this volume. Poetic dissimilarities between authors who were native Germanic-speakers vs. those who were native Romance-speakers are summarized by Wright in *A Sociophilological Study*, 110–123.

Sancte sator, suffragator,
 legum lator, largus dator,
 iure pollens, es qui potens,
 nunc in ethra firma petra...

[Holy creator, sustainer,
 lawgiver, bountiful provider,
 You Who are mighty in Your laws,
 are now a firm rock in heaven...] ¹¹³

Slightly less than half of the lines in *Carmen ad Deum* can be seen as complying with the rules of alliteration in Old English verse.¹¹⁴ The violations of these rules may be due at least partly to the fact that here again we see two conflicting verse systems interfering with one another: the Latin regular trochee with rhyme between and within the lines vs. the traditionally unrhymed Old English alliterative verse.

The analysis of the language contact phenomena in Latin and Old English shows that most of the mechanisms associated with contact-induced change were present in this contact situation. Many of them were only characteristic of the literary milieu (above all macaronic poetry and alliterating Latin poetry), and nearly all of them (perhaps excluding passive familiarity) were taking place within the bilingual group. To evaluate similar contact situations, it might be necessary to distinguish between relative and absolute intensity of contact. In the Anglo-Saxon setting, the former is a useful concept for describing the bilingual ecclesiastical community, with the intensity of contact varying from casual (ordinary secular clergy) to more intense (higher secular clergy and regular clergy). The latter concept is more useful for describing the overall population, whose contact with Latin must have been almost non-existent.

¹¹³ The full text of the *Carmen ad Deum* (or *Sancte sator*) and the translation reprinted here can be found in Michael Lapidge, "Theodore and Anglo-Latin Octosyllabic Verse," in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. Michael Lapidge, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 260–280, at 276. For bibliography on alliteration in Germano-Latin and Anglo-Latin poetry, see Lapidge, "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry," 218 n. 26. Compare also the two poems discussed in the section on code-switching.

¹¹⁴ Summarized by Geoffrey Russom in *Old English Meter and Linguistic Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 64–82, esp. 73. These rules are the following: (a) the strongest two metrical positions within the line must contain alliterating syllables; (b) a weak constituent of a weak constituent may not contain an alliterating syllable; (c) no alliterating syllable may occupy an x position; and (d) otherwise, alliteration is optional.

Conclusions

Contact between speakers of Latin and Old English was mostly limited throughout the pre-Conquest period. It would be safer to envisage a situation where language contact was possible through schooling, reading, writing, speaking within the ecclesiastical community to an extent, and translation; thus, literary competence in Latin indeed prevailed over oral competence.¹¹⁵ The contact situation can be approached from two perspectives: the Latin perspective and the Old English perspective. The former can be described in terms of second-language acquisition. Thus, we can assume that there developed a variety of Latin in England characterised by a local accent¹¹⁶ and other structural interference, as well as a number of lexical peculiarities (similar to *loco funeris dominati sunt*). The Old English perspective can be analysed in terms of second-language interference, marked by the dominant position of Latin as a language of literacy and prestige, and resulting in lexical borrowing, stylistic imitations, and syntactic calquing. I suggest that in the foreground of this contact situation, a variety of Old English emerged which, possessing lexical and syntactic complexity unknown to common Old English, was heading towards a social dialect. Although these language processes were taking place within a small bilingual community, their influence was essential for the development of English throughout the period. However, precisely because this language influence was bound to the small cultural elite, its era came to an end together with the shift of elites which took place soon after the Norman Conquest.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Wright's account of Boniface in *A Sociophilological Study*, 95–103.

¹¹⁶ Wright suggests that Anglo-Latin pronunciation as well as morphology were “antiquated” by Continental standards; see *A Sociophilological Study*, 7–8, 12–13, and 101–102.

Works Cited

Primary sources

- Ælfric. 1880. *Grammatik und Glossar*, ed. Julius Zupitza, Sammlung englischer Denkmäler 1. Berlin: Weidmann.
- . 1881–1900, reprinted 1966. *Lives of Saints*, ed. Walter W. Skeat. 2 vols. in 4, Early English Text Society o.s. 76, 82, 94, 114. London: Oxford University Press.
- . 1914. *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, trans. and ed. Bernhard Fehr, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 9. Hamburg: Verlag von Henri Grand.
- . 1967–1968. *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, ed. John C. Pope, Early English Text Society o.s. 259, 260. London: Oxford University Press.
- . 1979. *Catholic Homilies: The Second Series, Text*, ed. Malcolm Godden, Early English Text Society s.s. 5. London: Oxford University Press.
- . 1994. *Prefaces*, ed. Jonathan Wilcox. Durham: Durham Medieval Texts.
- Æthelweard. 1962. *The Chronicle of Æthelweard*, ed. A. Campbell. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.
- Aldhelm. 1919, reprinted 1961. *Opera*, ed. Rudolf Ehwald, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 15. Berlin: Weidmann.
- . 1985. *The Poetic Works*, trans. Michael Lapidge and James L. Rosier, with an appendix by Neil Wright. Cambridge: Brewer.
- Alfred. 1871, reprinted 1958. *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, ed. Henry Sweet, Early English Text Society o.s. 45. London: Oxford University Press.
- Asser. 1959. *Life of King Alfred*, ed. William Henry Stevenson. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bede. 1930, reprinted 1963. *Venerabilis Baedae Epistola ad Ecgbertum Antistitem*. Trans. and ed. J. E. King. In vol. 2 of *Baedae Opera Historica*. London: Heinemann.
- . 1969. *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Byrhtferth. 1995. *Enchiridion*, ed. and trans. by Peter S. Baker and Michael Lapidge, Early English Text Society s.s. 15. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crawford, Samuel, ed. 1922. *The Old English Heptateuch*, Early English Text Society o.s. 160. London: Oxford University Press.
- Dobbie, Elliott Van Kirk, ed. 1942. *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 6. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fulk, R. D., Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, eds. 2008. *Klaeber's Beowulf*, 4th ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Glare, P. G. W., ed. 1982, reprinted 1992. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gneuss, Helmut and Arnold Schröer, eds. 1964. *Die angelsächsischen Prosabearbeitungen der Benediktinerregel*, 2nd ed., Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 2. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Goldman, Lawrence, ed. 2004–2007. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Online edition*. London: Oxford University Press. <<http://www.oxforddnb.com>>.
- Healey, Antonette diPaolo, ed. 2004. *The Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004. <<http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/o/oec/>>.
- Hecht, Hans, ed. 1900. *Bischofs Wærferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*. Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 5. Leipzig: Georg H. Wigands Verlag.
- Hogg, Richard M., ed. 1992. *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kornexl, Lucia, ed. 1993. *Die Regularis Concordia und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

- Kurath, Hans et al., eds. 1952–2001. *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Moeller, E., J.-M. Clément, and B. Coppieters't Wallant, eds. 1993. *Corpus orationum II*, *Corpus christianorum*, Series Latina 160A. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Oxford English Dictionary*, Online edition. 2008. London: Oxford University Press. <<http://dictionary.oed.com/>>.
- Skeat, Walter W., ed. 1871–1887. *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Symons, Dom Thomas, ed. and trans. 1953. *Regularis concordia*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd.
- Thorpe, Benjamin, ed., 1844–1846. *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church: The First Part, Containing the 'Sermones Catholici', or, Homilies of Ælfric*. 2 vols. London: Ælfric Society.
- Vogüé, Adalbert de, ed. 1978. *Dialogues Grégoire le Grand*. Paris: Éd. du Cerf.
- Wulfstan. 1957. *The Homilies of Wulfstan*, ed. Dorothy Bethurum. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Secondary sources

- Abram, Christopher. 2007. Aldhelm and the Two Cultures of Anglo-Saxon Poetry. *Literature Compass* 4, no. 5: 1354–1377.
- Blair, John. 2005. *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, George Hardin. 1987. *Bede the Venerable*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Brown, Michelle P. 2003. *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Society, Spirituality and the Scribe*, The British Library Studies in Medieval Culture. London: The British Library.
- Disenza, Nicole Guenther. 2005. *The King's English: Strategies of Translation in the Old English Boethius*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Fulk, R. D. 1992. *A History of Old English Meter*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Gneuss, Helmut. 1972. The Origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's School at Winchester. *Anglo-Saxon England* 1: 63–83.
- . 1986. King Alfred and the History of Anglo-Saxon Libraries. In *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature, Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*, ed. Ph. R. Brown, G. R. Crampton, and Fred C. Robinson, 29–49. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- . 1993. *Anglicae linguae interpretatio*: Language Contact, Lexical Borrowing and Glossing in Anglo-Saxon England. 1992 *Lectures and Memoirs, Proceedings of the British Academy* 82: 107–148.
- Godden, Malcolm. Wærferth and King Alfred: The Fate of the Old English *Dialogues*. In *Alfred the Wise, Studies in Honour of Janet Batley*, ed. Jane Roberts and Janet L. Nelson, with Malcolm Godden, 35–51. Cambridge: Brewer.
- Harmer, Florence Elizabeth. 1914. *Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatcher, John. 1977. *Plague, Population and the English Economy 1348–1530*. Studies in Economic and Social History. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Hill, Joyce. 2003. Learning Latin in Anglo-Saxon England: Traditions, Texts and Techniques. In *Learning and Literacy in Medieval England and Abroad*, ed. Sarah Rees Jones, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 3, 7–29. Utrecht: Brepols, 2003.
- Hogg, Richard M. 1992. Phonology and Morphology. In *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume 1*, ed. Richard M. Hogg, 67–167. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janson, Tore. 1991. Language Change and Metalinguistic Change: Latin to Romance and Other Cases. In *Latin and the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Roger Wright, 19–28. London and New York: Routledge.

- Kastovsky, Dieter. 1992. Semantics and Vocabulary. In *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume 1*, ed. Richard M. Hogg, 290–408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelly, Susan. 1990. Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word. In *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick, 36–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ker, Neil R. 1957. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lapidge, Michael. 1979. Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse. *Comparative Literature* 31, no. 3: 209–231.
- . 1986. The Anglo-Latin Background. In *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*, ed. Stanley B. Greenfield and Daniel G. Calder, 5–37. New York: New York University Press.
- . 1993. The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature. In *Anglo-Latin Literature 900–1066*, 105–149. London: The Hambledon Press.
- . 1993. Schools, Learning and Literature in Tenth-Century England. In *Anglo-Latin Literature 900–1066*, 1–48. London: The Hambledon Press.
- . 1995. Theodore and Anglo-Latin Octosyllabic Verse. In *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. Michael Lapidge, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 11, 260–280. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1996. *Beowulf*, Aldhelm, the *Liber Monstrorum* and Wessex. In *Anglo-Latin Literature 600–899*, 271–312. London: Hambledon Press.
- . 2000. The Archetype of *Beowulf*. *Anglo-Saxon England* 29: 5–41.
- Maddicott, J. R. 1997. Plague in Seventh-Century England. *Past and Present* 156: 7–54.
- Maitland, Frederic William. 1897, reprinted 1907. *Domesday Book and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Millar, Eric George. 1923. *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Three Plates in Colour and Thirty-Six in Monochrome from Cotton MS. Nero D. IV in the British Museum*. London: The British Museum.
- Miller, Edward and John Hatcher. 1978. *Medieval England—Rural Society and Economic Change 1086–1348*, Social and Economic History of England. London: Longman.
- Moore, John S. 1997. 'Quot homines?' The Population of Domesday England. In *Anglo-Norman Studies XIX: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1996*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill, 307–334. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.
- Ogilvy, J. D. A. 1936. *Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (670–804)*, Studies and Documents 2. Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy of America.
- Orchard, Andy. 1994. *The Poetic Art of Aldhelm*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rissanen, Matti. 2006. Latin Influence on Old English Idiom: 'To Wit'. In *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. John Walmsley, 222–241. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Robinson, Fred C. 1994. 'The Rewards of Piety': 'Two' Old English Poems in Their Manuscript Context. In *The Editing of Old English*, 180–195. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Russell, Josiah Cox. 1944. The Clerical Population of Medieval England. *Traditio* 2: 177–212.
- . 1948. *British Medieval Population*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- . Demographic Aspects of the Norman Conquest. In *Medieval Demography*, with a preface by David Herlihy, 125–147. New York: AMS Press.
- Russon, Geoffrey. 1987. *Old English Meter and Linguistic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Schendl, Herbert. 2004. 'Hec sunt prata to wassingwellan': Aspects of Code-Switching in Old English Charters. *VIEWS* 13, no. 2: 52–68.
- Schrijver, Peter. 2002. The Rise and Fall of British Latin: Evidence from English and Brittonic. In *The Celtic Roots of English*, ed. Markku Filppula, Juhani Klemola and Heli Pitkänen, *Studies in Languages* 37, 87–110. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Humanities.
- Sharpe, Richard. 2002. The Naming of Bishop Ithamar. *English Historical Review* 117, no. 473: 889–894.
- Smyth, Alfred P. 2002. *The Medieval Life of King Alfred the Great: A Translation and Commentary on the Text Attributed to Asser*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave.
- Stanley, Eric G. 2001. Linguistic Self-Awareness at Various Times in the History of English from Old English Onwards. In *Lexis and Texts in Early English, Studies presented to Jane Roberts*, ed. by Christian J. Kay and Louise M. Sylvester, 237–253. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Stanton, Robert. 2002. *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge: Brewer.
- Stenton, F. M. 1971. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Strang, Barbara M. H. 1970. *A History of English*. London: Methuen.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- . and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Timofeeva, Olga. 2006. *Latinskie sintaksicheskie zaimstvovania v drevneangliyskom yazyke* [Latin Syntactic Borrowings in Old English]. St. Petersburg: Gelikon Plus.
- . 2009. Translating Texts Where *et verborum ordo mysterium est*: Late Old English Idiom vs. *ablativus absolutus*. *Journal of Medieval Latin* 19: 217–229.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953, reprinted 1974. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Wrenn, Charles L. 1933. 'Standard' Old English. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1933, 65–88.
- Wright, Roger. 1982. *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France*. Liverpool: Cairns.
- . 2002. *A Sociophilological Study of Late Latin*, *Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy* 10. Turnhout: Brepols.

INTERLINGUISTIC COMMUNICATION IN BEDE'S *HISTORIA
ECCLESIASTICA GENTIS ANGLORUM*¹

Alaric Hall
University of Leeds

1. *Problems and approaches*

The intellectual stimulus for this paper, and much of the thinking behind it, arose from my time at the University of Helsinki, first as a visiting doctoral student under Matti's supervision and subsequently as his colleague. The University of Helsinki is officially bilingual between Finnish and Swedish, while for my close colleagues most speaking, writing and reading of a professional nature was conducted in a third language, English. For me to enter this situation as a scholar interested in medieval multilingualism, whose personal background was in a monoglot segment of British culture and an indefatigably monoglot education system, was enormously mind-opening. And no-one provided a warmer welcome to my research on—or to my own aspirations to—multilingualism than Matti.

For Britain, the period from the fifth century to the eighth was crucial to the rise of English and Gaelic at the expense of the p-Celtic dialects (the ancestors of Welsh, Cornish, Cumbric and Pictish) which had been dominant a few centuries before. It is also traditionally assumed to be the time when British Latin, another competitor to p-Celtic which had taken root while Britain was under Roman rule, died as a vernacular language; nevertheless, Latin emerged from the period

¹ The latter period was at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, under whose aegis much of the research for this paper was undertaken. The ideas here have also benefited from airings at Helsinki's Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English, the International Medieval Congress at the University of Leeds, and the Scottish Medieval Studies seminar series at the University of Glasgow, and I am grateful for the suggestions received on these occasions. I am particularly indebted to Nick Evans, Bethany Fox, Anthea Fraser Gupta, Jukka Tyrkkö and Charles West, besides Matti himself, for discussions of the material here.

as an important language of writing and religion. The role in these developments of migration to Britain from the Continent and Ireland has been much pondered and debated, albeit for many years through archaeological and historical methodologies focused on ethnic identity and political structures rather than through linguistic approaches *per se*:² only recently have linguistic methodologies, reframing the issue in terms of language-shifts and—competition, started to gain prominence in the field.³ Even recent work, however, has tended primarily to address the expansion of English and Gaelic only in its earliest stages—for which we have virtually no direct evidence.

The present article looks to a time when we do have some direct evidence, albeit of a problematic and limited kind: Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, completed around 731, supplemented by reference to other roughly contemporaneous Anglo-Latin texts.⁴ For many years the main article devoted to Bede's portrayal of language-use in Britain was André Crépin's 'Bede and the Vernacular' of 1976, whose main concern was with the relationship between Bede

² For the historiography of these debates in England see Nicholas Higham, *Rome, Britain and the Anglo-Saxons* (London: Seaby, 1992), esp. 1–16; Nick Higham, "From Sub-Roman Britain to Anglo-Saxon England: Debating the Insular Dark Ages," *History Compass* 2 (2004): 1–29, DOI: 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2004.00085.x; Nick Higham, "Britons in Anglo-Saxon England: An Introduction," in *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Nick Higham, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 7 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 1–15; for Scotland see Alex Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba*, *The New Edinburgh History of Scotland* 2 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 312–352.

³ Most work has focused on English: see prominently the articles in *The Celtic Englishes*, ed. Hildegard L. C. Von Tristram, *Anglistische Forschungen* 247, 286, 324, 3 vols. (Heidelberg: Winter, 1997–2003); in *The Celtic Roots of English*, ed. Markku Filppula, Juhani Klemola and Heli Pitkänen, *Studies in Languages* 37 (Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Humanities, 2002); and in *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Nick Higham, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 7 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007). It should be noted, however, that place-names have long provided an important, if under-theorised, component in the debate; for a convenient summary of the *status quo* regarding England see Richard Coates, "Invisible Britons: The View from Linguistics," in the latter volume, 172–91, working paper available at <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/linguistics/documents/rc_britons.pdf>. For the Celtic-speaking regions see for example Woolf, *From Pictland*, 322–40.

⁴ *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, corrected reprint (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991). Translations of this and other texts are my own.

and Old English poetry.⁵ In 2001, Georges Tugene's *L'idée de nation chez Bède le Vénérable* opened up a range of useful perspectives on language in Bede's theology, and to some extent in his conception of nationhood.⁶ I draw on this extensively below, but Tugene does not attempt to answer linguistic questions *per se*. But Bede presents us with one of our main windows onto the early history of North Britain and the expansion of Gaelic there, while recent studies have emphasised that the kingdom of the Northumbrians, in which he wrote, had only recently assimilated many areas whose inhabitants must to a significant extent have been speakers of p-Celtic.⁷ Moreover, looking past the evidence afforded by Bede's own Latinity, his text also includes some slight but important evidence for the state of British Latin.

The *Historia ecclesiastica* generally provides two sorts of evidence for vernacular multilingualism: narratives and place-names. As Adams emphasised in his magisterial study of Roman bilingualism, anecdotal evidence about language contact is much inferior to that provided by documents like bilingual inscriptions.⁸ A good number of early Anglo-Saxon inscriptions do survive but none offers parallel bilingual texts, while the parallel bilingual inscriptions surviving from the west and north of Britain are laconic, so Bede's anecdotal evidence is worth sifting.⁹ It is problematic for two main reasons. Firstly, Bede's

⁵ André Crépin, "Bede and the Vernacular," in *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede*, ed. Gerald Bonner (London: SPCK, 1976), 170–192.

⁶ Tugene, Georges, *L'idée de nation chez Bède le Vénérable*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Moyen Âge et Temps Modernes 37 (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2001).

⁷ David Rollason, *Northumbria, 500–1100: Creation and Destruction of a Kingdom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 57–109; Nicholas Higham, "Britons in Northern England in the Early Middle Ages: Through a Thick Glass Darkly," *Northern History* 38 (2001): 5–25; Alex Woolf, "Caedualla Rex Brettonum and the Passing of the Old North," *Northern History* 41 (2004): 1–20; Bethany Fox, "The P-Celtic Place-Names of North-East England and South-East Scotland," *The Heroic Age* 10 (2007): <<http://www.heroicage.org>>.

⁸ J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 9–14.

⁹ For England see generally Elizabeth Okasha, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971) and her supplements in *Anglo-Saxon England* 11 (1983), 83–118; 21 (1992), 37–85; and 33 (2005), 225–81; for the west see for example T. M. Charles Edwards, *Early Christian Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 163–172; and for the north Katherine Forsyth, "Literacy in Pictland," in *Literacy in Medieval Celtic Societies*, ed. Huw Pryce (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 39–61, available at <<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/2461>>; "Hic memoria perpetua: The Early Inscribed Stones of Southern

reconstructions of the past doubtless arose from a combination of knowledge from sources (of varying reliability), inference from his own experience, and invention, but it is hard to guess in what proportions. He discusses interlinguistic communication rather rarely, leaving many anecdotes when we (and perhaps he) would have liked to know more about how his characters communicated.¹⁰ When Bede does mention interlinguistic communication, it is also hard to know how far his anecdotes represent the exception or the rule. Secondly, Bede wrote primarily to convey and support a raft of ideologies, on themes both political and theological, and any information he gives is liable to have been shaped or even invented to fit these.¹¹ If nothing else, studying Bede's portrayal of interlinguistic communication can help us to explore his promotion of these ideologies; but I argue that it is also possible to glimpse some details beyond them.

Meanwhile, place-names in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, which again received their most intensive study in the 1970s, represent a category of evidence so problematic that it does not even register in Adams's book.¹² Place-names are a distinctive lexical category; those given by Bede may sometimes reflect his sources more than his own onomasticon; and his scholarly interest in the etymology and semantics of toponymy will have given him conceptual tools for promoting ide-

Scotland in Context," in *Able Minds and Practised Hands: Scotland's Early Medieval Sculpture in the 21st Century*, ed. Sally M. Foster and Morag Cross, The Society for Medieval Archaeology, Monographs 23 (Leeds: The Society for Medieval Archaeology, 2005), 113–134.

¹⁰ To give a few examples: when Augustine met the bishops and scholars of a British kingdom shortly after 600 (ii.2), did they converse in Latin, and if so how comfortably? When Cuthbert preached in the 660s in the mountains north and west of Melrose (iv.27), a region then only recently brought under Anglo-Saxon rule, did he (ever) speak Brittonic or Latin? And when the Irish monk Adomnán spoke to Abbot Æbbe of Coldingham around 680 (*HE* iv.25), did he use English, Irish or Latin?

¹¹ For a recent survey and analysis of these issues see N. J. Higham, *(Re-)Reading Bede: The 'Ecclesiastical History' in Context* (London: Routledge, 2006).

¹² Principally Barrie Cox, "The Place-Names of the Earliest English Records," *Journal of the English Place-Name Society* 8 (1975–76): 12–66; J. Campbell, "Bede's Words for Places," in *Names, Words, and Graves: Early Medieval Settlement. Lectures Delivered in the University of Leeds, May 1978*, ed. P. H. Sawyer (Leeds: The School of History, University of Leeds, 1979), 34–54 (repr. in *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London: Hambledon Press, 1986), 99–119); Colin Smith, "Romano-British Place-Names in Bede," *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 1 (= B.A.R. British Series 72, ed. Sonia Chadwick Hawkes, David Brown and James Campbell) (1979): 1–19.

ologies through the handling of names.¹³ But place-names offer one of our only opportunities to see an Anglo-Saxon dealing with other British vernaculars in practice, a process made more interesting by the fact that place-names were often potentially lexically meaningful. They also, again, shed light on Bede's relationship to Britain's Latin traditions.

Our traditional narratives present a situation between the fifth and eighth centuries in which p-Celtic dialects were lower status varieties than English, Irish and Latin in most if not all regions. This argument is largely teleological, being based on the later linguistic situation and the fact that in areas which switched from p-Celtic, p-Celtic place-names tended to be lost on a large scale. It is not without contemporary evidential support, however. Latin, Irish and latterly Old English were used extensively in monumental inscriptions; Brittonic was not, while if Pictish was, then it was largely in the form of the Pictish symbols rather than an alphabetic script.¹⁴ While the language of writing was usually Latin—as Bede's own output emphasises—by Bede's time, Irish already had a lively tradition of vernacular literature.¹⁵ If the ascription of a number of Irish texts to him reflects genuine literary activity, this provides a context for the decision of King Aldfrith of Northumbria (r. c. 685–705), the son of Oswiu king of Northumbria and Fína the daughter of Colmán Rímid, king of Tara, to write in Irish rather than English or Latin, in both of which he seems to have enjoyed considerable facility.¹⁶ English began to be used for writing

¹³ Witnessed most clearly by his toponymic glossary to I Samuel, *Beda's Venerabilis opera pars II: opera exegetica 2. In primam partem Samvhelis libri IIII; In regvm librvvm XXX qvaetiones*, ed. D. Hurst, Corpus Christianorum, series Latina 119 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1962), 273–287, though its focus is geographical rather than linguistic. See further A. H. Merrills, *History and Geography in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 242 (and, for Bede's interest in geography, chapter 4 generally); Diane Speed, "Bede's Mapping of England," in *Travel and Travellers from Bede to Dampier*, ed. Geraldine Barnes and Gabrielle Singleton (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2005), 9–23, accessed from <<http://www.c-s-p.org/Flyers/9781904303510-sample.pdf>> April 30th 2008 (esp. 9–12); on etymology in Bede generally, see for example Damien Bracken, "Virgil the Grammarian and Bede: A Preliminary Study," *Anglo-Saxon England* 36 (2005): 7–21, DOI 10.1017/S0263675106000020, at 7–15, and references therein.

¹⁴ See Forsyth, "Literacy".

¹⁵ See generally Andy Orchard, "Latin and the Vernacular: The Creation of a Bilingual Textual Culture," in *After Rome*, ed. Thomas Charles-Edwards (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 191–219.

¹⁶ Colin Ireland, "Aldfrith of Northumbria and the Irish Genealogies," *Celtica* 22 (1991): 64–78, accessed from <<http://www.celt.dias.ie/publications/celtica>> April 1st

glosses and probably law-texts around the later seventh century, and poetry—perhaps including some of our main long poems—during the eighth.¹⁷ Writing in Brittonic might have begun by this time, but if so our evidence is for fewer and less diverse texts, while Pictish, as far as we can tell, never had a literary tradition.

As is to be expected, the present article largely supports this picture, but puts some flesh on the bones, and introduces some subtleties. I begin with Bede's depiction of the Synod of Whitby, proceeding to the evidence for Latin as a medium of spoken communication, and finishing with communication between speakers of different vernaculars. Bede's narratives afford no evidence for Latin as a spoken *lingua franca* between Anglo-Saxon and Irish churchmen, but do afford evidence for communication in the vernacular. This point is supported by Bede's ability to render some Irish names into English. However, Bede offers one or two hints that Britons retained their traditions of spoken Latin (whether or not Latin was still a mother tongue to any of them), including evidence for pronunciation which might derive from spoken communication. Moreover, it is possible to read his text to exhibit not only anxiety about obstacles in the way of Anglo-Saxons' access to Latin texts, but also a sense of competition with his British neighbours. Meanwhile, the prominence of Irish in Bede's conception of the Anglo-Saxon past contrasts with the virtual absence of anecdotal

2008; *Old Irish Wisdom Attributed to Aldfrith of Northumbria: An Edition of Briathra Flainn Fhíra maic Ossu*, ed. and trans. Colin A. Ireland, *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies* 205 (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1999), 52–56; cf. Higham, *(Re-)Reading Bede*, 42–43.

¹⁷ J. D. Pheifer, "Early Anglo-Saxon Glossaries and the School of Canterbury," *Anglo-Saxon England* 16 (1987): 17–44; for the early dating of Æthelberht's law-code see Lisi Oliver, *The Beginnings of English Law*, *Toronto Medieval Texts and Translations* 14 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 34–51; eighth-century poetry includes *Cædmon's Hymn* and that on the Ruthwell Cross and Franks Casket, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, ed. Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* 6 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), 105–106, 115–116; *Guthlac A* claims to have been composed during the lifetimes of the contemporaries of the eponymous saint (d.714), and I see no compelling reason to disbelieve the claim: Alaric Hall, "Constructing Anglo-Saxon Sanctity: Tradition, Innovation and Saint Guthlac," in *Images of Sanctity: Essays in Honour of Gary Dickson*, ed. Debra Higgs Strickland, *Visualising the Middle Ages* 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 207–235, available at <<http://www.alarichall.org.uk>>, at 209; cf. Jeffrey J. Cohen, *Medieval Identity Machines*, *Medieval Cultures* 35 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), p. 121. For the key evidence that *Beowulf* and *Genesis A* should be eighth-century or little later see R. D. Fulk, *A History of Old English Meter* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 348–351.

reference to p-Celtic languages; there is also just enough evidence to argue that the absence of translations of p-Celtic names in the *Historia ecclesiastica* represents Bede's ignorance of p-Celtic as well as a desire to alienate Britons. Combining these approaches, we can perhaps perceive the power of vernacular English and Irish/Scottish ecclesiastical discourses to marginalise not only Brittonic-speaking, but also Latin-speaking Britons in the growing kingdom of Northumbria. This in turn affords new perspectives on the potential role of the Church in effecting language-change in early medieval Britain.

2. *The Synod of Whitby*

It is as well to start with Bede's single most striking portrayal of cross-linguistic communication, his detailed account of the Synod of Whitby (*HE* iii.25).

Ueneruntque illo reges ambo, pater scilicet et filius; episcopi, Colman cum clericis suis de Scottia, Agilberctus cum Agathone et Uilfrido presbyteris. Iacobus et Romanus in horum parte erant; Hild abbatissa cum suis in parte Scottorum, in qua erat etiam uenerabilis episcopus Cedd, iamdudum ordinatus a Scottis, ut supra docuimus, qui et interpres in eo concilio uigilantissimus utriusque partis extitit... iussit rex et Agilberctum proferre in medium morem suae obseruationis, unde initium haberet, uel qua hunc auctoritate sequeretur. Respondit Agilberctus: "Loquatur, obsecro, uice mea discipulus meus Uilfrid presbyter, quia unum ambo sapimus cum ceteris, qui hic adsident, ecclesiasticae traditionis cultoribus; et ille melius ac manifestius ipsa lingua Anglorum, quam ego per interpretem, potest explanare, quae sentimus."

[And both the kings came there, that is both father and son; and the bishops Colmán, from *Scottia* (Ireland and Dál Riata) with his clerics, and Agilberct with his priests Agatho and Wilfrid. James and Romanus were on their side, and Abbess Hild and her followers on the side of the *Scotti*, which included even the venerable bishop Cedd, ordained by the *Scotti* long before as we described above; he also served as a very careful interpreter between the two parties in that council... The king ordered Agilberct too to make known his own practice, whence it had its origin, or by what authority it was followed. Agilberctus replied: "I request that my disciple, the priest Wilfrid, speak, because we both understand the same thing as the other supporters of our ecclesiastical tradition who sit alongside us here; and he can explain what we think better and more clearly himself in the language of the *Angli*, than I can through an interpreter."]

What I find striking here, and what seems to have escaped comment previously, is that without feeling any need for comment on the fact *per se*, Bede presented a major ecclesiastical meeting between people of different language backgrounds taking place not in what we might have assumed to be the *lingua franca* of early medieval western Christendom, Latin, but in two vernaculars, English and Irish. It would be simple to assume that vernaculars were used at the Synod purely for the benefit of the kings present, since they were fluent in English and Irish but cannot be expected to have spoken Latin, and this is perhaps what previous scholars have silently concluded; any conclusions about the languages which churchmen of different language-backgrounds used, then, must be drawn from this passage only with caution. Even so, however, a close look at the detailed portrayal of interlinguistic communication which Bede offers here is revealing in a range of ways.

As I have mentioned, the complexities in interpreting any story of Bede's are numerous, but it is possible to establish some interpretative parameters. Bede's known (and perhaps only) source for the Synod of Whitby, chapter 10 of Stephanus's *Vita Wilfridi*, makes little mention of language issues.¹⁸ According to Stephanus,¹⁹

imperatum est ab Aegilbercto episcopo transmarino et Agathone presbitero suo, sancto Wilfritho presbitero et abbati suaviloqua eloquentia in sua lingua Romanae ecclesiae et apostolicae sedis dare rationem

[Wilfrid, priest and abbot, was ordered by the foreign bishop Agilberht and Agatho his priest to present the case for the Roman Church and the apostolic seat with pleasing eloquence *in sua lingua*].

In sua lingua could mean 'in his own words', but also—and more obviously—'in his own language'.²⁰ The former interpretation is encouraged by Stephanus's dramatic portrayal of the participants agreeing about Saint Peter's guardianship of Heaven "una voce" ('with one voice'): although this is not to be taken as evidence for a common language, it promotes images of linguistic harmony rather than diversity, perhaps recalling of the Pentecost miracle in the Acts of the Apostles, 2.1–13, whereby the Holy Spirit enabled the Apostles to be heard by

¹⁸ On the prospect of other written sources see Catherine Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils c. 650–c. 850* (London: Leicester University Press, 1995), 90.

¹⁹ *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus*, ed. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927), 20 (ch. 10).

²⁰ *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975–), s.v. "lingua."

each member of their diverse audience in his own language.²¹ Bede, however, seems to have understood (or chosen to understand) Wilfrid to have been asked to speak in his native language.

In Goffart's reading of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, which saw Wilfrid's role in Northumbrian history to have been systematically downplayed, Bede wanted to ascribe Wilfrid's prominence over Agilberht more to the happy accident of his native language than his personal talents.²² This could fit with Bede's claim earlier in the same book that Agilberht was dismissed from the West Saxon episcopacy because King Cenwealh, "qui Saxonum tantum linguam nouerat" ('who knew only the language of the *Saxones*') was tired of his "barbarae loquellae" ('barbarous speech;' *HE* iii.7). This has not widely been considered a plausible motive for the dismissal,²³ so conceivably Bede introduced the point partly to reduce our surprise at Agilberht's delegation of responsibility to Wilfrid at the Synod of Whitby. But Goffart's reading has recently met with convincing resistance,²⁴ and at any rate it seems unlikely that Bede would have developed Stephanus's fleeting hint at linguistic differences at the synod so thoroughly solely to explain Wilfrid's prominent participation. Bede's specification in the same chapter that King Oswiu was "illorum [Scotorum] etiam lingua optime inbutus" ('extremely able in their [the *Scotti*'s] language'), coupled with the details he provided about Cedd's role as an interpreter, shows an interest in the complexities of communication between

²¹ Colgrave, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, 22; *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, ed. Robert Weber, 2nd rev. ed, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1975), II 1699–1700.

²² Walter Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550–800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 311–312.

²³ E.g., Crépin, "Bede and the Vernacular," 177; J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People: A Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 99–100; N. J. Higham, *The Convert Kings: Power and Religious Affiliation in Early Anglo-Saxon England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 255. On Agilberht's language see further René Derolez, "Language Problems in Anglo-Saxon England: *barbara loquella* and *barbarismus*," in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Korhammer (Cambridge: Brewer, 1992), 285–292, at 287–289.

²⁴ Higham, (Re-)Reading Bede, 63–69, esp. 65. For Goffart's own response to earlier criticisms, see his "Bede's History in a Harsher Climate," in *Innovation and Tradition in the Writings of the Venerable Bede*, ed. Scott DeGregorio, *Medieval European Studies* 6 (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2006), 203–26. Cf. Kesikahio's article in this volume, pp. 126–28.

different language-groups that goes beyond a concern to reinterpret Wilfrid's role.

A more convincing ideological explanation for Bede's portrayal of the synod arises from his exegetical handling of the Pentecost miracle. As Merrills, building on the work of Tugene, has shown, the Acts of the Apostles was the text with which Bede engaged first and most often as a scholar, and his own *Historia ecclesiastica* was fundamentally indebted to it.²⁵ It might first be noted that in his commentary on the Babel story in Genesis, Bede claimed that a positive aspect of the division of language was that it left heretics split up and assailing one another's position rather than the Church's.²⁶ But despite Bede's passionate opposition to the non-Roman position in the Easter controversy, the multilingual character of the synod in his account can hardly be taken to represent the divergent bickering of heretics, since one side is right, and the overall outcome is a move (albeit partial) towards unity. The account does fit, however, with Bede's handling of the Pentecost miracle in his commentaries on both Genesis and Acts of the Apostles itself: unlike most early medieval commentators, he celebrated the linguistic diversity brought about by Babel, judging that, following the Pentecost miracle, "collecti ex omni natione quae sub caelo est populi, una et non dispari confessione ac fide, laudes et magnalia Dei resonarent" ('peoples, gathered from every nation under Heaven, were shouting the praise and greatness of God with a single and undivided confession and faith').²⁷ Bede's emphasis on multilingualism at Whitby almost certainly reflects this exegetical point.²⁸

A desire to present unity of faith in multilingual communities, however, does not seem to me a sufficient explanation for Bede implying the absence of Latin as a *lingua franca* at the Synod of Whitby. One argument here is that the story does not actually end with unity, since Colman and some of his followers simply leave Northumbria (though Bede does wait until the following chapter before he admits this, facili-

²⁵ *History*, pp. 240–49; Tugene, *L'idée*, 302–32.

²⁶ *Bedaе venerabilis opera, pars II: opera exegetica 1. Libri quatuor in principium Genesis usque ad nativitatem Isaac et eiectionem Ismahelis adnotationum*, ed. C. W. Jones, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 118a (Turnhout: Brepols, 1967), 161–62 (3.11.8–9).

²⁷ Jones, *Bedaе venerabilis opera*, 152 (3.11.1). See further Robert Stanton, "Linguistic Fragmentation and Redemption before King Alfred," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 36 (2006): 12–26, at 19–23, on which this paragraph is based.

²⁸ Cf. Merrills, *History*, 275–276.

tating a tone of unity at the end of iii.25). Another is that in the opening book of his *Historia ecclesiastica*, Bede famously portrayed Latin as a unifying language of the British Isles:

Haec in praesenti, iuxta numerum librorum, quibus lex diuina scripta est, quinque gentium linguis, unam eandemque summae ueritatis et uerae sublimitatis scientiam scrutatur, et confitetur, Anglorum uidelicet, Brettonum, Scottorum, Pictorum et Latinorum, quae meditatione scripturarum ceteris omnibus est facta communis.

[At the present time, just like the number of the books in which the divine law is written, one and the same wisdom of sublime truth and true sublimity is sought out and confessed in the languages of five peoples, namely the *Angli*, and *Brettones*, the *Scotti*, the *Picti*—and the *Latini*, which, through meditation on the scriptures, has been made common to all the others.]

This passage is, admittedly, problematic; my translation here is literal, to bring out points which will be important below. The key point here is that the passage surely shows that Bede was willing to identify Latin as a unifying language. It seems unlikely, then, that Bede would have claimed that the Synod of Whitby was undertaken in the vernacular if he actually believed it had been conducted in Latin.

If vernaculars were used at the Synod of Whitby for the benefit of the kings present, the choice may equally have been for the benefit of clerics: we have ample evidence that at Bede's time not only kings, but many monks and priests knew no Latin, nor could read; Bede himself stated in his *Epistola ad Ecgberhtum episcopum* that some Anglo-Saxon monks and priests "propriae tantum linguae notitiam habent" ('have familiarity only with their own language').²⁹ Bede did not remark on the presence of kings as the reason for communication in the vernacular even though his account is detailed with regard to their linguistic skills and the linguistic aspects of the synod generally. At any rate, kings and other laymen were frequently present at synods, so Whitby need not be unrepresentative.³⁰ Perhaps more interesting is

²⁹ *Venerabilis Baedae Historiam ecclesiam gentis Anglorum, Historiam abbatum, Epistolam ad Ecgberhtum una cum Historia abbatum auctore anonymo*, ed. Charles Plummer, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), I 409–410, at 410, cf. 418–419. See further the evidence gathered by Higham, *(Re-)Reading Bede*, 41–44 and Paul G. Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse: Studies in 'Genesis', 'Exodus' and 'Daniel'*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 16 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 55–58.

³⁰ Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils*, 44–49.

a tangential but nonetheless telling point: Bede presented Cedd as an interpreter for the parties. The only information which Bede gives in the *Historia ecclesiastica* which would explain Cedd's unusual abilities is that he had been trained by Finan on Lindisfarne (*HE* iii.21), which Bede characterised as Cedd's *domus* ('home'; *HE* iii.22). In Bede's conception, it was unremarkable that an Anglo-Saxon trained by Finan emerged fluent in Irish. Cedd's experience would be paralleled by that of the ninth-century bishop whom the Irishman Findan met among the Picts, "qui...in Hibernia insula litteralibus erat studiis inbutus et eiusdem linguae notitia satis eruditus" ('who...had been imbued with the study of letters in the island of Ireland and was well acquainted with the usage of its language'), except that Cedd did not go abroad to study, but merely to an Irish foundation.³¹ This goes some way towards showing that the Irish vernacular was an important language for communication by churchmen in seventh-century England, even those whose Latin was good enough that they could become bishops.

Although the evidence is not unequivocal, then, the Synod of Whitby suggests that we should take Bede's statement that Latin had been made common to all the nations of Britian "meditatione scripturarum" ('through the study of the scriptures') not as a piously-phrased claim to the general use of Latin as a *lingua franca*, but to mean exactly and only what it says: that Latin was shared only as a literary, scholarly medium. This inference has ramifications for the history of multilingualism in three areas:

1. Whatever the specific impulses behind their use, it is clear that in Oswiu's Northumbria, as Bede envisaged it, English and Irish were both viable languages for ecclesiastical meetings, while what little we know of Cedd implies that to get ahead in an Irish-run monastery, one had to learn Irish; a young man wishing to make a career at Jarrow may have found English no less vital. If major ecclesiastical meetings and monastic education were conducted in the vernacular, then they were liable to affect the competitiveness

³¹ Quoting from the text in Reidar Th. Christiansen, "The People of the North," *Lochlann: A Review of Celtic Studies 2/Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap*, supplementary volume 6 (1962), 137–164 (including a translation of the text by Kevin Ó Nolan pp. 155–164), at 151; this was reprinted from *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Scriptores* 15.1 (Hannover: Hahn, 1883), available at <<http://www.dmgh.de>>, 502–506.

of vernacular languages as media of public discourse, particularly since, as Cubitt suggested, "provincial synods were probably the largest assemblies of their day."³²

2. Although the significance of the point is hard to determine, the account emphasises that in some circumstances, it was easier to rely on interpreters than to use Latin as a *lingua franca*.
3. Despite the fact that Northumbria's inhabitants must have included Brittonic-speakers, clerics perhaps among them, Brittonic itself leaves no trace. This is merely an argument from silence, but as I discuss below, the silence in the *Historia ecclesiastica* is resounding. It seems that if these people wished to participate in a synod like that at Whitby, neither Brittonic nor Latin would help them: they would have needed access to the prestige vernaculars.

These points are generally consistent with other pointers towards the relative status of English, Irish, Brittonic and Pictish at Bede's time, sketched in my introduction. What they add are hints as to how these statuses were established and maintained.

3. *Bede's attitudes to Anglo-Latin*

Combined with the other evidence mentioned, then, the absence of Latin as a *lingua franca* from the Synod of Whitby can be used to question the potential status of Latin as a *lingua franca* in early medieval Britain. Certainly the evidence mentioned above—and the more extensive discussion afforded by Timofeeva in this volume—shows that we cannot simply assume, with Crépin, that

Latin was all the more easily learnt as children entered the monastery quite young—Bede at seven—and henceforward were submitted to a kind of Latin intoxication. They had to learn Latin by heart, read Latin, chant Latin, speak Latin, write Latin, think Latin, dream Latin.³³

Indeed, in at least some monasteries, English and Pictish novices may have been more likely to find themselves dreaming in Irish than Latin. However, although my arguments have relevance for how we guess

³² Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils*, 39.

³³ "Bede," 171; on Bede's Latinity generally see 173–174.

at the nature and quality of Latin-learning, that relationship is not simple. One reason for not speaking Latin would be complete ignorance; but it is also possible to read and write a language well without being able to understand a native speaker's speech at all. We also know that Latin accents varied according to educational policy and native language background, which could have affected communication between people of different educational backgrounds who could otherwise converse easily in Latin.³⁴

Some of the evidence provided by Bede and contemporaneous Anglo-Saxon texts for Anglo-Saxons' inability to speak Latin is unambiguous; other evidence is susceptible of too broad a range of interpretation for it to be profitable to analyse it in detail here. What I want to pick up on here are two wider themes in Bede's writing, to contextualise my subsequent examination of his evidence for spoken British Latin: on the one hand the triumph of the Catholic Church over linguistic diversity, but on the other an anxiety at the difficulties for Anglo-Saxons of accessing the Church's teachings.³⁵

That Bede considered Latin to be of high status, even in a specifically English context, is evident in various ways. One example is place-names: I have argued elsewhere that even where Bede did not know the Latin names of Roman places, sometimes he at least adverted to their previous identity by specifying that the names he gave were English.³⁶ This implies that they had had Latin names, and suggests that Bede was a little more sensitive to Roman naming-traditions in Britain than

³⁴ On Britons' pronunciation see below; and on Britons' and Irishmen's Anthony Harvey, "Notes on Old Irish and Old Welsh Consonantal Spelling," in *Celtic Linguistics/Ieithyddiaeth Geltaidd: Readings in the Brythonic Languages. Festschrift for T. Arwyn Watkins*, ed. Martin J. Ball, James Fife, Erich Poppe and Jenny Rowland, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series IV: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 68 (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1990), 403–410; "Retrieving the Pronunciation of Early Insular Celtic Scribes: Towards and Methodology," *Celtica* 21 (1990): 178–190, available at <<http://www.celt.dias.ie/publications/celtica>>. On Irishmen's pronunciation specifically see Pádraig Breatnach, "The Pronunciation of Latin in Medieval Ireland," in *Scire litteras: Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben*, ed. Sigrid Krämer and Michael Bernhard, Abhandlungen (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse), neue Folge 99 (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988), 59–72; on Anglo-Saxons', Olga Timofeeva, this volume.

³⁵ Cf. Tugene, *L'idée*, 294–302.

³⁶ "The Evidence of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* for the Replacement of Roman Place-Names by English ones During the Anglo-Saxon Period," working paper available at <<http://www.alarichall.org.uk>> (when published the final version of the paper will continue to be available via this URL).

his explicit mention of such names would suggest. A few pointers also show that Bede considered that, where they had existed, Roman place-names were the more correct ones, the related vernacular forms being *corruptus*.³⁷ This leads on to the fact that Bede might at times give a (well-known) Roman place-name without an English equivalent even when he knew one, as shown by *Lugubalia*, named only in Latin in the *Historia ecclesiastica* but given the vernacular alternative *Luel* in Bede's earlier prose *Vita Cuthberti* and its anonymous source.³⁸ More prominent examples, whose vernacular names Bede must have known but never states, are *Eboracum*, York, known in Old English by the phonetically derived (though also folk-etymologised) name of *Eoforwic*, and *Doruuernis*, Canterbury, known as *Cantwaraburh*. This suggests the relatively high status of Latin in Bede's eyes.³⁹

Turning to the narratives of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Bede envisaged that one reason why the first Gregorian missionaries to England had contemplated turning back was that they did not know the language of the English. He made a point of the missionaries' acquisition of Frankish interpreters (*HE* i.23, 25), and also quoted Gregory's comment on Job 36.29–30 (essentially a statement of God's omnipotence),

Ecce lingua Britanniae, quae nil aliud nouerat quam barbarum fremdere, iam dudum in diuinis laudibus Hebreum coepit alleluia resonare. Ecce quondam tumidus, iam substratus sanctorum pedibus seruit oceanus, eiusque barbaros motus, quos terreni principes edomare ferro nequiuerrant, hos pro diuina formidine sacerdotum ora simplicibus uerbis ligant, et qui cateruas pugnantium infidelis nequaquam metueret, iam nunc fidelis humilium linguas timet.⁴⁰

³⁷ "Rutubi portus, a gente Anglorum nunc corrupte Reptacæstir uocata" (i.1); "ad Lugubaliā, quae a populis Anglorum corrupte Luel vocatur" in the prose *Vita Cuthberti*, ed. Bertram Colgrave, *Two 'Lives' of Saint Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), 242 (ch. 27); see further on *Carlegion~Legacæstir* below.

³⁸ *HE* iv.29; *Two 'Lives' of Saint Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life*, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), 122 and 124 (anonymous text) and 242 (Bede's text).

³⁹ For further discussion see Mehan and Townsend, "'Nation'," 10–13.

⁴⁰ *HE* ii.1, quoting Gregory, *Moralia in Job* 17.11.21 (*S. Gregorii magni Moralia in Job*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, *Corpus Christianorum series Latina* 143, 143a, 143b, 3 vols. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979–85), III 1346).

[Behold the tongue of Britain, which did not know anything other than to gnash incomprehensibility: it has begun to resound, in divine praise, the *alleluia* of the Hebrews. Behold the ocean, once swollen: now, laid low, it serves at the feet of saints; and the mouths of priests, through divine awe, bind its barbarous movements, which terrestrial rulers had been unable to tame with iron. And he who, faithless, never feared hordes of warriors, now, faithful, fears the tongues of the humble.]

Here Gregory contrasted the barbarous pre-conversion communication of Britain with the communication of Christians, which he specifically associates with a Hebrew word, *alleluia*. Bede interpreted the passage to refer to the English and although he was almost certainly wrong (since Gregory's words probably predate Augustine's mission),⁴¹ his reading resonated with later Anglo-Saxons: the short, neumed hymn on the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons by Gregory and Augustine added at the end of the *Vita sancti Dunstani* on folio 89v of British Library, Cotton Cleopatra B. xiii, in a hand dating from the first half of the eleventh century, concludes with the lines

Ecce lingua brittannie
frendens olim barbarie.
In trinitate unica
iam alleluia personat.
Prouentv euuangelice.⁴²

[Behold the tongue of Britain
once gnashing incomprehensibility:
now in the single trinity
alleluia resounds,
through success of evangelical [preaching].]

Gregory may not have intended his description to refer to a linguistic divide, merely to the distinction between foolish and Christian speech, but Bede seems to have interpreted his words as referring to linguistic difference: in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, the quotation sets the scene for the famous anecdote relating Gregory the Great's pun-

⁴¹ Clare Stancliffe, "The British Church and the Mission of Augustine," in *St Augustine and the Conversion of England*, ed. Richard Gameson (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 107–51, at 112.

⁴² Transcribed from *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile: Volume 8, Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials*, ed. Jonathan Wilcox, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 219 (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2000), text 185, with dating from Wilcox's description in the accompanying booklet.

ning association of *Anguli* ('Angles') with *angeli* ('angels') reported by Bede later in the same chapter, a story also found in chapter 9 of the anonymous Whitby *Liber beatae Gregorii papae* (which may have been Bede's source, and which Gregory's words in the *Moralia in Job* may originally have inspired).⁴³ Bede's interpretation of Gregory fitted nicely with his views of the Pentecost miracle, but it also represented a colonial discourse of civilised centre and barbarous periphery, articulated with reference to linguistic difference, which Bede found himself replicating.⁴⁴ Accordingly, it is possible to read Gregory's puns, as recounted by Bede, on the one hand

as wrenching the vernacular language away from its autonomous use by the English themselves...imposing Latin upon it as the bearer of all spiritually authentic meaning

and on the other as "the beginnings of a negotiation between two languages rather than the imposition of one upon the other."⁴⁵ Either way, however, Bede's handling of Gregory emphasises the theme of the linguistic divide between Anglo-Saxons and the centres of Roman Christianity. It is also worth noting that in the Whitby *Life*, which can be read as representing a more assertive Anglo-Saxon stance to Latin than Bede's, the boys who are the subject of Gregory's pun talk to Gregory themselves, implying a degree of Latinity and presenting the English as the active party in making contact with Rome; but in Bede's text, the boys are slaves and do not speak for themselves.⁴⁶ As in the account of the Synod of Whitby when compared with Stephanus's version, Bede again tends to emphasise obstacles to Anglo-Saxons' Latin communication.

⁴³ *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great, by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*, ed. Bertram Colgrave (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1968), 90–94. A case for the literate origins of the story, opening up the possibility that Gregory's writings themselves could have encouraged it, is made by Michael Richter, "Bede's *Angli*: Angles or English?" *Peritia* 3 (1984): 99–114, at 102–105 and Alan Thacker, "Memorializing Gregory the Great: The Origin and Transmission of a Papal Cult in the Seventh and Early Eighth Centuries," *Early Medieval Europe* 7 (1998): 59–84, DOI: 10.1111/1468-0254.00018, at 69–70.

⁴⁴ On Gregory see further Stanton, "Linguistic Fragmentation," 14–17; on Bede's response see further Merrills, *History*, 276; on colonisation see Uppinder Mehan and David Townsend, "'Nation' and the Gaze of the Other in Eighth-Century Northumbria," *Comparative Literature* 53 (2001): 1–26.

⁴⁵ Mehan and Townend, "'Nation'," 9–10.

⁴⁶ Mehan and Townend, "'Nation'," 13–25.

In a similar vein, Bede envisaged the Pictish King Nechtan stating that he and his people wished to follow Catholic custom despite being “tam longe a Romanorum loquella et natione” (‘so distant from the speech/conversation and nation of the Romans;’ *HE* v.21). Moreover, when Abbot Ceolfrid’s long Latin letter on the subject arrived, “cum praesente rege Naitono multisque uiris doctioribus esset lecta, ac diligenter ab his, qui intellegere poterant, in linguam eius propriam interpretata” (‘it was read in the presence of King Nechtan and many learned men, and carefully translated into his own language by those who could understand it;’ *HE* v.21). This brief phrase leaves us with some important uncertainties. We do not know who Bede envisaged to have been doing the translating here: Picts who understood Latin? Northumbrian monks? Irish ones? Nor need the translation have been into Pictish: Clancy has gathered evidence for “the hybrid and no doubt bilingual nature of the aristocracy” of Nechtan’s court, and Nechtan himself, making Irish a serious possibility.⁴⁷ In any case, Bede’s portrayal may be based more on the Latinity of Northumbrian kings than Pictish ones.⁴⁸ But Bede’s emphasis on a lack of lay access to Latin learning remains clear.

Notwithstanding possible overtones of Latin as a colonising language in some of Bede’s material, his emphasis on challenges to communication with Roman Christianity can be read thus far as a celebration of the Christian, and English, triumph over adversity. But Bede was also anxious that the English had been, and to a large extent continued to be, excluded from Christian discourses by their inability to speak Latin. I have mentioned some evidence for this in the previous section. We may add that he wrote a large number of Latin works intended to educate people whose Latin was less strong than his own, and apparently made some English translations too, for monolinguals among the laity, monks and priests.⁴⁹ He considered that to be as fluent in Latin as in English testified to great learning.⁵⁰ Chapter 21 of his *Historia abbatum* bluntly depicts the companions of Abbot Ceolfrith, who died in the Romance-speaking settlement of Langres

⁴⁷ Thomas Owen Clancy, “Philosopher-King: Nechtan mac Der-Ilei,” *The Scottish Historical Review* 83 (2004): 125–149, at 146. See further section 5 below.

⁴⁸ Higham, *(Re-)Reading Bede*, 43.

⁴⁹ See Judith McClure, “Bede’s *Notes on Genesis* and the Training of the Anglo-Saxon Clergy,” in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), 17–30.

⁵⁰ *HE* iv.2; v.20.

(about forty miles north of Dijon) in 717, as remaining there “inter eos, quorum nec linguam nouerant, pro inextinguibili patris affectu” (‘among those whose language/idiom they had not learnt/were not acquainted with, out of inextinguishable love for their father’).⁵¹ The text emphasises these monks’ piety, but also—whatever their precise linguistic skills—their inability to communicate with the native Latin-speakers of Langres.

Numerous other anecdotes from Bede’s time elucidating Anglo-Saxons’ problems with Latin communication could be adduced—among them the request by the secular noble Berhtfrith that Wilfrid translate a papal judgement;⁵² the apparent ability of Wilfrid’s party to understand Pope John VI’s Latin in contradistinction to his Greek;⁵³ Boniface’s ability orally to translate a passage of scripture read out by the future Saint Gregory of Utrecht, which Gregory himself could vocalise but not understand;⁵⁴ or Boniface’s own difficulty in discussing matters of theology orally with Pope Gregory II.⁵⁵ All are too open to interpretation to use as evidence for the precise detail of speakers’ abilities, but all remind us of the extent to which Anglo-Saxons could find themselves struggling to cope in communicating with the Roman world.

4. *British Latin*

Anglo-Saxons’ access to Latin clearly varied, and Bede preferred in his *Historia ecclesiastica* to strike a tone of communicative success, facilitated by divine beneficence against long odds. But I have suggested that we can also identify real anxiety concerning the obstacles between

⁵¹ Plummer, C., *Venerabilis Baedae Historiam*, I 386.

⁵² Colgrave, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, 130 (ch. 60).

⁵³ Colgrave, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, 112 (ch. 53).

⁵⁴ *Luidgeri vita Gregorii Abbatis Traiectensis*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores* (in folio) 15 part 1 (Hannover: Hahn, 1887), 63–79, available at <<http://www.dmgh.de>>, at 68.

⁵⁵ *Vitae Sancti Bonifatii Archiepiscopi Moguntini*, ed. Wilhem Levison, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi* 57 (Hanover: Hahn, 1905), 28; see further Roger Wright, *A Sociophilological Study of Late Latin*, *Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy* 10 (Turnhout, Brepols, 2002), 95–109 (trans. from ‘Latino e Romanzo: Bonifazio e il Papa Gregorio II’, in *La preistoria dell’italiano: Atti della tavola rotonda di linguistica storica*, *Università Ca’ Foscari di Venezia*, 11–13 giugno 1998, ed. J. Herman and A. Marieniti (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000), pp. 219–29).

Anglo-Saxons and the Latin language, and a sense of precariousness regarding achievements in Latin-learning. Different implications arise on both counts, however, from the sole explicit appearance of British Latin in the *Historia ecclesiastica*. Bede (*HE* v.9) tells us that the priest Ecgberht

in Germania plurimas nouerat esse nationes, a quibus Angli uel Saxones, qui nunc Britanniam incolunt, genus et originem duxisse noscuntur; unde hactenus a uicina gente Brettonum corrupte Garmani nuncupantur

[knew that there were many peoples in *Germania* (on the Germanic-speaking Continent), from whom the *Angli*, or *Saxones*, who now inhabit Britain, are known to derive their stock and origin—for which reason they are incorrectly still called *Garmani* by the neighbouring nation of the Britons].

The form *Garmani* corresponds with a development of *er* > *ar* widespread in Vulgar Latin. This is attested in Roman inscriptions in Britain and also a number of Latin loan-words in Welsh (including the personal name *Garmon* < *Germanus*). Meanwhile, the development of *er* > *ar* is not attested in the insular Brittonic languages, so we must assume that *Garmani* represents a Latin form rather than a Latinisation by Bede of a Brittonic form.⁵⁶ Bede presents us, then, with a plausible British Latin usage.

Why did Bede comment at this point in his *Historia ecclesiastica* on what the Britons called the Anglo-Saxons? Ostensibly, he was simply providing some semantic evidence for the origins of the Anglo-Saxons; if we view his motives generously, we might say that he coupled it with a detail about British pronunciation as a point of philological interest. But this is an insufficient explanation: Bede had already discussed the Germanic origins of the Anglo-Saxons in detail, adducing a range of sources, without referring to Britons' usage of *Germani*.⁵⁷ The reason

⁵⁶ Kenneth Hurstone Jackson, *Language and History in Early Britain: A Chronological Survey of the Brittonic Languages, First to Twelfth Century A.D.*, University of Edinburgh Publications, Languages and Literature Series 4 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1953), 281; J. N. Adams, "British Latin: The Text, Interpretation and Language of the Bath Curse Tablets," *Britannia* 23 (1992): 1–26, at 12–13. For the appearance of the development in Breton see Peter Schrijver, "The Rise and Fall of British Latin: Evidence from English and Brittonic," in *The Celtic Roots of English*, ed. Markku Filppula, Juhani Klemola and Heli Pitkänen, Studies in Languages 37 (Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Humanities, 2002), 87–110, at 99. Contrast *germanwr* cited below.

⁵⁷ The information in *HE* I.15 may be a late addition to the work (Philip Bartholomew, "Continental Connections: Angles, Saxons and Others in Bede and in

why Bede brought Britons up in Book V was surely to underscore his claim that they had never tried to convert the English—contrasting them with Ecgberht, who desired to convert the relatives of the English.⁵⁸ This point affords an example of a key theme in the *Historia ecclesiastica*; my concern here, however, is to assess what Bede's jibe tells us about British Latin.

Firstly, the form *Garmani* implies continuity in the traditions of British Latin learning and pronunciation in a period which, falling between the remarkable Latin fluency of Gildas and the next extensive piece of British Latin prose, the *Historia Brittonum*, we have little clear evidence for British Latin.⁵⁹ British Latin pronunciation also appears to have extended beyond Bede's time: nearly three centuries later, this time in Wessex, the preface to Ælfric's *Grammar* comments that

miror valde quare multi corripunt sillabas in prosa, quae in metro breves sunt, cum prosa absoluta sit a lege metri, sicut pronuntiant "pater" Brittonice et "malus" et similia, quae in metro habentur breves. Mihi tamen videtur melius invocare *Deum* patrem honorifice producta sillaba, quam Brittonice corripere, quia nec Deus arti grammaticae subiciendus est.

[it absolutely amazes me how many people corrupt those syllables of prose which in metre are breves, when prose should be free from the rules of metre; thus they pronounce *pater*, *malus* and the like in the British way, which they have as breves in metre. To me, however, it seems better to invoke God the Father with a worshipfully enounced syllable, than to corrupt it in British fashion, because God is not placed below the art of grammar.]⁶⁰

This comment must reflect the partial preservation of etymological vowel-length in spoken British Latin, a phenomenon also attested in Latin loans into Welsh and which almost certainly shows continuity from the pronunciation of Latin as a mother tongue in Roman

Procopius," *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 13 (2005): 19–30, at 20) but Book I's discussion of the Anglo-Saxons' migrant status would still be substantial without it.

⁵⁸ Cf. Higham, *(Re-)Reading Bede*, 134–42.

⁵⁹ For the prospect of Northern British Latin writing around Bede's time, see John Thomas Koch, *The 'Gododdin' of Aneirin: Text and Context from Dark-Age North Britain* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1997), cx–cxxvii.

⁶⁰ *Ælfric's Prefaces*, ed. Jonathan Wilcox, *Durham Medieval Texts* 9 (Durham: Durham Medieval Texts, 1994), 115.

Britain.⁶¹ Ælfric's south-western evidence encourages the conclusion that the distinctive British Latin to which Bede referred was part not only of an old but also an ongoing British tradition of pronunciation.

A second implication of the form *Garmani* is simply that Bede somehow knew of this pronunciation. It is possible that he had simply seen the form in one or more British Latin documents, in which case the form and usage could predate his own time; but if so, he was generalising dramatically to attribute the usage to the whole *gens Brittonum*. Moreover, although it is an argument from silence, it might also be supposed that a British Latin document mentioning *Garmani* in the sense of 'Anglo-Saxons' would have been an interesting source for Bede, and although he mentions the Briton Gildas, he mentions no other such source. On balance, Bede's statement suggests that Anglo-Saxons sometimes heard British Latin. It would be possible to hear it during the liturgy; but since *Germanus* is very unlikely to have occurred in liturgical material in this sense, Bede's comments on its semantics indicate that other kinds of Latin communication took place, militating against the idea that Latin was never used as a *lingua franca*. Developing this point is hard because it is hard to guess whether Bede had heard *Garmani* first hand or knew it as hearsay (perhaps even as a comical stereotype). The furthest we can go is to note evidence that Bede had at least probably met people who had met British clerics.⁶²

Either way, these points relate to a third implication, arising from Bede's own main point, which is to comment on the British Latin lexis: *Germani* was used of the Anglo-Saxons by the Britons, but it

⁶¹ Melinda J. Menzer, "Speaking Brittonice: Vowel Quantities and Musical Length in Ælfric's *Grammar*," *Peritia*, 16 (2002): 26–39, at 28–30. At 33 she argued that *prosa* here refers specifically to liturgical texts, on the grounds that vowel-length would have a significant effect there, whereas "it seems extreme for Ælfric to express himself so passionately about how the Welsh speak Latin in everyday conversation." Her interpretation is possible, but Ælfric, like Bede (and perhaps indeed partly under the influence of the *Historia ecclesiastica*), may have objected so strongly to British Latin pronunciation because of its implications for cultural identity; it is noteworthy in this connection that the comments quoted were prominently placed at the end of his preface.

⁶² Perhaps the clearest evidence is that he knew Pecthelm (*HE* v. 13, 18, 23), who was made the first bishop over the see of Whithorn, then doubtless at least partly a p-Celtic speaking region, around 700 and who seems likely to have been in touch with Gallovidian traditions of the Brittonic saint Uinniau (known to the Irish as Findan and to the English, in this argument, as Ninian): Thomas Owen Clancy, "The Real St Ninian," *The Innes Review* 52 (2001): 1–28; James E. Fraser, "Northumbrian Whithorn and the Making of St Ninian," *The Innes Review* 53 (2002): 40–59.

seems that Bede considered that Britons not only mispronounced this word, but misused it too. Elsewhere, Bede only used *Germani* to denote Continental Germanic peoples, but the Britons used it of the English.⁶³ This claim is admittedly paralleled in our Welsh and British Latin sources only by the unique, poetic Middle Welsh compound *Germanwr* 'Germanic man,' since the usual term, in British Latin as on the Continent in Bede's time, was, in Latin, *Saxones* and, in Welsh (giving the Modern Welsh form), *Seisnig*—but since Bede's phonological information seems plausible, it is reasonable to consider his semantic information to be plausible too.⁶⁴ Bede seems to be suggesting that Anglo-Saxons know how they and their relatives should be named in Latin better than Britons do. Whether other Anglo-Saxons would have agreed with Bede is open to question: Aldhelm at any rate styled himself as "*Germanicae gentis cunabulis confotum*" ('nurtured in the cradles of the Germanic people') in chapter 142 of his *De metris* around perhaps the 670s.⁶⁵ An implication of the labelling of Anglo-Saxons as *Germani* which probably suited many Britons was that they properly belonged in *Germania* rather than in *Britannia*; Bede's comment, conversely, doubtless relates to his distinctive championing of the ethnic label of *Angli* for the Germanic peoples in Britain, marking a break with their heathen past and adverting to a narrative of divine sanction for their presence on the island.⁶⁶ At any rate, Bede shows that the usage of Latin ethnonyms had become a site of competition in his construction of Anglo-Saxon identities in contradistinction to British ones.

To Bede's fleeting textual evidence for the vivacity of British Latin, we may add a little onomastic evidence. Stancliffe has emphasised that Bede's spelling of the Brittonic names *Brocmail* and *Dinoot* seems to reflect Old Welsh spelling conventions, which suggests that these names, and the stories in which they occur, were accessed via British

⁶³ HE i.2, 15, 21; iii.13; cf. *De temporum ratione* XV (*Bedaе venerabilis opera, Pars VI: Opera Didascalica*, ed. C. W. Jones, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 123a, 123b, 2 vols. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1975–77), II 331.

⁶⁴ *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru/A Dictionary of the Welsh Language* (Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1950–2003), s.v; Richter, "Bede's *Angli*."

⁶⁵ *Aldhelmi Opera*, ed. Rudolf Ehwald, Monumenta Germanicae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 15, 3 vols. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1919), available at <<http://www.dmgh.de>>, 202.

⁶⁶ For a survey and development of this issue see Erin Thomas A. Dailey, "The *Vita Wilfridi* and the *Vita Gregorii*: Their Place in Early English Ethnogenesis," forthcoming; cf. Richter, "Bede's *Angli*."

Latin documents.⁶⁷ Rivet and Smith observed that Bede not only used a large number of Roman place-names which he could have learnt from known Roman or ecclesiastical texts, but also gave a number of place-names which are Latinisations of ancient p-Celtic names for which he seems not to have had Roman written sources: *Campodunum* (probably at Leeds; *HE* ii.14), *Cataracta/Cataracto* (Catterick, *HE* ii.14, 20, iii.14), and *Deruuentio* (referring to the Derwent in Yorkshire in *HE* ii.9 and 13 and the one in Cumbria in iv.29) appear nowhere else in surviving records. Rivet and Smith also inferred that Bede's form *Uenta* (used of Winchester, *HE* iii.7 *et passim*) probably came through "ecclesiastical tradition, presumably continuous in this instance from late Romano-British times," while none of our other surviving written sources for *Calcaria* (Tadcaster, *HE* iv.23) or *Lugubalia* (Carlisle, *HE* iv.29) was known to Bede.⁶⁸ Bede is also a key witness to the English adoption of the Latin name *Verulamium* (now St Albans) into English, apparently directly from Latin, as *Uerlamacæstir* (*HE* i. 7).⁶⁹ It is hard to doubt that Bede received at least some of these names ultimately from British Latin traditions.

The minimalist and maximalist interpretations of the evidence of the *Historia ecclesiastica* for British Latin are distant: at the extremes we might imagine Bede on the one hand chatting to a local British priest who spoke Latin as a mother tongue (Bede's racist attitude to Britons, in this reading, not precluding friendly relations with indi-

⁶⁷ "The British Church," 126–128. Paul Cavill, "Bede and Cædmon's Hymn," in *'Lastworda Betst': Essays in Memory of Christine E. Fell with her Unpublished Writings*, ed. Carole Hough and Kathryn A. Lowe (Donington: Tyas, 2002), 1–17, at 4–5, has made the same suggestion regarding Bede's spelling of the etymologically Brittonic name *Cædmon*. <m> in Anglo-Saxon spelling represented /m/, but in Brittonic and British Latin at this time, the graph would have been pronounced /v/, and had the name *Cædmon* been transmitted orally from eighth-century Brittonic, we would expect it to have been spelt **Cæduon* or **Cædfon* by Bede. However, *Cædmon* could have entered the English name-stock at a time when the consonant /μ/ still existed in Brittonic, which we would expect to see borrowed as Old English /m/, or might simply show assimilation to the Old English name-element *monn*. For a recent discussion of related evidence see Duncan Probert, "Mapping Early Medieval Language Change in South-West England," in *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Nick Higham, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 7 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 231–44, at 237–40.

⁶⁸ A. L. F. Rivet and Colin Smith, *The Place-Names of Roman Britain* (London: Batsford, 1979), s.vv. *Calcaria*, *Cambodunum*, *Cataractonium*, *Derventio*, *Luguvalium*, *Venta Belgarum*, quoting from 492; cf. Smith, "Romano-British Place-Names," 4–6 and 9, where he attributes Bede's form *Uenta* to Gildas.

⁶⁹ Richard Coates, "Verulamium, the Romano-British Name of St Albans," *Studia Celtica*, 39 (2005): 169–76.

viduals), or on the other reading an imperial administrative document. What we probably can say is that for Bede, England's Roman past and its naming traditions had a legitimacy which English could not quite match up to, and somewhere in the tradition underlying the *Historia ecclesiastica*, some Roman names were being established from British Latin sources. The combination of these points with the evidence of continuity from Roman Latin to British Latin pronunciation, the communication of this pronunciation to Bede, and the fact that the British use of ethnonyms seems to have irked Bede hints that British Latin was reasonably vivacious.

Setting this reading alongside Bede's concerns about Anglo-Saxons' abilities in and access to Latin, we might even perceive a certain self-consciousness on Bede's part at the Anglo-Saxons' lack of a Latinate heritage in the face of a British society which both had a Latinate heritage and was maintaining it. In my translation of Bede's famous enumeration of the five languages of Britain above, I made a point of translating phrases like *lingua Anglorum* as 'the language of the English' even though they were an unmarked way of saying 'the English language.' The literal translation brings out two important points. The first is that Bede implicitly correlated language with ethnicity, a point which can be paralleled in other Anglo-Saxon sources.⁷⁰ The second is that Bede's phrase *lingua gentis Latinorum*, unlike the usual and less ethnically charged *lingua Latina*, was marked.⁷¹ As Tugene emphasised, Bede's term surely implies that Latin was an ethnic language

⁷⁰ Tugene, *L'idée*, 294, suggested that "en fait, si langue et nation sont mises en relation à cette époque, c'est surtout dans les spéculations théoriques des clercs" ('in fact, if language and nation are linked in this period, this is primarily in the theoretical speculation of clerics'), perhaps influenced by Walter Pohl's influential "Telling the Difference: Signs of Ethnic Identity," in *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300–800*, ed. Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz, *The Transformation of the Roman World 2* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 17–69. But this surely underrates the fact that the Old English words *þeod* and *geþeode* could mean both 'nation' and 'language': Bede's correlation, I think, reflects deep-seated attitudes among Anglo-Saxons. Cf. Julia M. H. Smith, *Europe after Rome: A New Cultural History 500–1000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 17 (citing the Old English *Genesis A* lines 1684–1690: *Genesis A: A New Edition*, ed. A. N. Doane (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), 161).

⁷¹ A rough and ready search of the *Patrologia Latina Database*, <<http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk>>, is sufficient to make the point: the strings *lingua Anglorum* and *Anglorum lingua* together produce 20 hits in 10 entries, whereas *anglica lingua* and *lingua anglica* produce 8 hits in 8 entries. By contrast, while the strings *Latinorum lingua* and *lingua Latinorum* produce one hit (and *Romanorum lingua/lingua Romanorum* three), the strings *latina lingua* and *lingua latina* afford 481 hits in 336 entries.

in some sense on the same level as the vernaculars of Britain.⁷² His reading was that this reflects Bede's views on the Pentecost miracle, which celebrated linguistic diversity in doctrinal conformity,⁷³ a reading to which I have no objections. However, I also suggest that the term *lingua Latinorum* may have helped Bede to wrest a Latin-speaking identity from the Britons by linking it with an ethnic identity to which they had no claim. Bede avoided any implication of Latin as a native language of Britain at the beginning of his *Historia* by labelling it the *lingua gentis Latinorum* ('language of the people of the *Latini*'), and having emphasised that fact later by dividing Britain into four languages (those of the Britons, Picts, Irish and English, *HE* iii.6), his comment in Book V that Anglo-Saxons were called *Garmani* "a uicina gente Brettonum" looks like a slip, accidentally aligning the speech of the Britons with Latin. Perhaps, then, Bede's aside reveals more about the strength of British Latin than he meant it to.

5. Vernacular multilingualism

I turn now to the vernaculars in Bede's writing. I have already mentioned his prominent identification of four of these, those of the Britons, Irish, Picts and English (*HE* i.1; iii.6), but it is worth adding that Bede was also sensitive to variation within English itself. His comment that the noble origin of the captive thegn Imma was recognised by, amongst other things, his *sermones* ('utterances, speech') is in fact our principal evidence for the existence of social register in Old English at any period (*HE* iv.22). It is also possible that when Bede mentioned that King Cenwealh spoke only the *lingua Saxonum*, he was perhaps distinguishing it not only from Agilbert's Latin, but his own native *lingua Anglorum*: the famous list of kings who ruled "in regibus gentis Anglorum cunctis australibus" ('in all the southern regions of the people of the English') includes "Caelin rex Occidentalium Saxonum, qui lingua ipsorum Ceaulin uocabatur" ('Caelin king of the West Saxons, who in their language is called Ceaulin;' *HE* ii.5). It is not unlikely that this distinction between the Northumbrian *Cælin* and West Saxon *Ceawlin* reflects the spelling of the name in a written source of Bede's, so his comments here may simply reflect his desire to preserve the

⁷² Tugene, *L'idée*, 55–58, and more generally and more subtly on 293–32.

⁷³ T 293–32; cf. Merrills, *History*, 274–276.

spelling of his source while making it comprehensible to his audience; certainly Tugene inferred from Bede's decision not to linger on this point that "il ne s'intéresse pas aux implications politiques de la situation dialectale" ('he does not concern himself with the political implications of the dialectal situation').⁷⁴ All the same, Bede's words betray an awareness of dialectal difference, conceptualised along ethnic lines, and the possibility remains that they reflect Bede's awareness through spoken language of the West Saxon development known as palatal diphthongisation.⁷⁵

Meanwhile, Bede is explicit that some Anglo-Saxons were monolingual English-speakers, from King Cenwealh to the many *idiotae* ('uneducated people') of Bishop Ecgberht's flock for whom he prescribed the learning of the Lord's Prayer and the Apostle's Creed in the vernacular (presumably meaning English, but conceivably other vernaculars too). When Bede does explicitly present bilingual Anglo-Saxons, he portrays them as exceptions rather the rule; and these appear concerning interactions between English and Irish. In addition to his account of the Synod of Whitby, we have his portrayal of Bishop Aidan's first preaching in Bernicia (in 635; *HE* iii.3):

pulcherrimo saepe spectaculo contigit, ut euangelizante antistite, qui Anglorum linguam perfecte non nouerat, ipse rex suis ducibus ac ministris interpretis uerbi existeret caelestis; quia nimirum tam longo exilii sui tempore linguam Scottorum iam plene didicerat

[one was often touched by a truly beautiful sight as the bishop, who did not have a full command of the language of the *Angli*, was evangelising: that the king himself served as the interpreter of the celestial word for his ealdormen and thegns, doubtless because, the period of his exile being so long, he had learned the language of the *Scotti* thoroughly].

It is worth emphasising that *nimirum* ('doubtless, truly, evidently') here suggests that Bede was inferring how King Oswald knew Irish, so the point may be a better guide to what Bede thought plausible than to what actually happened. Either way, he does not seem to have viewed Irish as a normal part of an English king's accomplishments.

⁷⁴ *L'idée*, 294.

⁷⁵ Cf. Tugene, *L'idée*, 295. See further Wallace-Hadrill, *Bede's "Ecclesiastical History"*, 59, 220. Rollason, *Northumbria*, 117 suggested that "it is clear... that 'Northumbrian' did not diverge greatly from other dialects of Old English and was certainly not the sort of distinctive language which would have contributed to defining a people's identity," but small linguistic variations can bear considerable cultural importance.

More striking, perhaps, is the otherwise unusual evidence provided here that Irish clerics learnt English—albeit, in Aidan’s case, imperfectly. These inferences are consistent with Bede’s description of how Aidan appeared unexpectedly sad at a feast held by Oswine king of Deira shortly before Oswine’s murder in 651, and how Aidan’s priest enquired why “suus lingua patria, quam rex et domestici eius non nouerant” (‘in his native language, which the king and his household did not understand;’ *HE* iii.14). Again, it seems that knowledge of Irish was not normal, and we might take as implicit in the story the idea that Aidan and his priest were otherwise speaking English. These anecdotes supplement Bede’s account of the Synod of Whitby to suggest that during Aidan’s period of activity in Northumbria (c. 635–51) the ability to understand Irish in the courts of Northumbrian kings was not common, but also that most Northumbrians in royal circles would have heard Irish. If this was true in Oswine’s time, it would have been no less true in the reign of his son and successor Aldfrith (685–c. 705), whose mother tongue was Irish and whose upbringing had been at least partly in Ireland.⁷⁶

Outside Bede’s listings of the languages of Britain, p-Celtic languages, by contrast with English and Irish, are never mentioned as such in the *Historia ecclesiastica*—they appear only implicitly, in the form of names. Since Bede was keen on presenting the spread of the (Roman) Christian message as a triumph in the face of linguistic barriers, in the spirit of the Pentecost miracle, and objected to the Britons’ (supposed) failure to evangelise the English, it made sense to imply that it would have been easy for them to talk to the English, contrasting this with the detail given on the linguistic challenges which Irish missionaries faced and overcame. The question here is whether we can move beyond this point to wider sociolinguistic conclusions.

A clue is of course offered by the roughly contemporary Anglo-Saxon mention of Brittonic in Felix’s *Vita sancti Guthlaci* (composed between 714 and 754): Guthlac awakes one night in his hermitage thinking that he hears a noisy crowd, and

verba loquentis vulgi Brittanicae agmina tectis succedere agnoscit;
nam ille aliorum temporum praeteritis voluminibus inter illos exulabat,
quoadusque eorum strimulentas loquelas intelligere valuit.

⁷⁶ Ireland, “Aldfrith,” esp. 67–68; Michael Lapidge, “The Career of Aldhelm,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 36 (2007): 15–69, DOI: 10.1017/S0263675100000028, at 22–26.

[recognised the words of a speaking crowd and that British hordes were approaching his home; for he had lived among them in exile in the past events of other times, for which reason he was able to understand their *strimulentae* utterances.]

It turns out, in fact, that the voices are those of demons—whose Brittonic speech is characterised as “*strimulentas loquelas*.” *Strimulens* appears to be a *hapax legomenon*, presumably with some onomatopoeic quality; Colgrave offered ‘sibilant,’⁷⁷ but whatever the case it seems not to have been a positive characteristic: manuscripts A₂, E₂ and G (of which A₂ is a tenth-century Anglo-Saxon manuscript) give the unambiguous “*barbaras loquelas*” (‘barbaric speech’). Likewise, although the Old English translation of this passage (of uncertain age, but probably written by the end of the ninth century) mentions simply a “*mycel werod þara awyrgendra gasta on bryttisc sprecende*” (‘great troop of those accursed spirits speaking Brittonic’), the focus of interest for the translator is shown by his title for the chapter: “*Hu þa deofla on brytisc spræcon*” (‘How the devils spoke in Brittonic’).⁷⁸ Rather than being an incidental detail in an exemplum on the theme of faith, the fact that the demons speak Brittonic becomes the message of the story. Moreover, the fact that Guthlac understands Brittonic seems to require explanation, suggesting that this was an unusual skill for aristocratic or monastic Anglo-Saxons. Together, these points suggest that Brittonic was viewed as an ugly language for a demonised people, a view presumably arising from general racism rather than some specific gripe about Britons’ failure to evangelise the English. Such views would, of course, have made Brittonic less competitive in English public spheres.

A little more purchase on Bede’s attitudes to Irish and Brittonic is afforded by his handling of place-names. There are, naturally enough, far fewer Irish place-names than English ones in the *Historia ecclesiastica*—only four—but Bede handles them in much the same way as the English ones: he accurately translates *Dearmach* as “*campus roborum*” (‘field of oaks;’ iii.4) and *Inisboufinde* as “*insula uitulae albae*”

⁷⁷ *Felix’s Life*, 111.

⁷⁸ *Das angelsächsische Prosa-Leben des hl. Guthlac*, ed. Paul Gosser, *Anglistische Forschungen* 27 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1909), 135–136; as pointed out by Cohen, *Medieval Identity Machines*, 144. On dating see Jane Roberts, “Hagiography and Literature: The Case of Guthlac of Crowland,” in *Mercia: An Anglo-Saxon Kingdom in Europe*, ed. Michelle P. Brown and Carol A. Farr (London: Leicester University Press, 2001), 69–86, at 77–80, 84–85.

(‘island of the white calf,’ iv. 4). Nor were these the only occasions when he sought to mediate unfamiliar Irish names to his audience. On introducing the *Dalreudini* in the first chapter of the *HE*, Bede etymologised their name as deriving from that of their leader Reuda, proceeding to add that the *Dalreudini* must be named after him “nam lingua eorum daal partem significat” (‘because in their language *daal* means a *pars* (‘part’, here in the sense ‘dynasty’)). Earlier references in Scottish and Irish sources show that the name *Reuda* has its origin in the Irish cultural zone, and Bede’s story seems likely too to represent a Dál Riatic origin myth, strengthening the evidence for ties between him and Irish-speaking sources.⁷⁹ Not only does Bede correctly mediate the Old Irish word *dál* into Latin, but in doing so he will have prompted his readers to recall the similar Old English word *dāl* ‘a part,’ not least because it seems in Northumbrian usage to have been as common as the better-attested form *dæl*.⁸⁰ Meanwhile, on the two occasions when Bede gives etymologically Irish names without translating them (*Rathmelsigi* iii.27, *Mag éo~Muig éo* iv.4), he does specify that they *lingua Scottorum appellatur*, both showing that he at least recognised Irish in these cases and mitigating possible confusion and so alienation on the part of the reader.⁸¹ How much Irish Bede knew cannot be judged from this evidence, but it suggests at least a superficial knowledge of core vocabulary and a willingness to mediate between Irish names and Latin textuality on much the same terms as English ones.

Bede’s handling of English and Irish names contrasts with his handling of names derived from the name-stock of Britain’s p-Celtic speakers; these are numerous in the *Historia ecclesiastica*.⁸² Some,

⁷⁹ James Fraser, “Dux Reuda and the Corcu Réti,” in *Cànan & Cultur/Language and Culture: Rannsachadh na Gàighlig* 3, ed. Wilson McLeod, James E. Fraser and Anja Gunderloch (Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press, 2006), 1–9.

⁸⁰ *Dictionary of the Irish Language: Based Mainly on Old and Middle Irish Materials* (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1913–75), available at <<http://www.dil.ie>>, s.v. “1 dāl;” *Dictionary of Old English: A to G online*, ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey, et al. with web interface by Peter Mielke and Xin Xiang (Toronto: DOE project, 2007), <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>>, s.vv., esp. “dāl” §B.

⁸¹ Accordingly, when Bede mentions the island of Iona (*Hii* iii.3), which was associated for him with the Irish monk Aidan, he does not claim its name to have been Irish—and indeed it is not, rather being of obscure etymology.

⁸² Moreover, I have suggested that Bede may have alluded to more Brittonic names tacitly by specifying that some names were *lingua Anglorum*, implying that there may have been alternative forms: “The Evidence of Bede’s *Historia*”.

admittedly, are of obscure etymology even to specialists today (e.g., *Badonicus mons*; *HE* i.16), or are old Roman names functioning in the *Historia ecclesiastica* as Latin names (as with the examples given in the previous section). Others still may have been too fully assimilated to the Old English name-stock for their p-Celtic character to have been noteworthy or even apparent (e.g., the tribal name *Bernicii*; *HE* ii.14 *et passim*). Even so, we may list at least seven reasonably transparently meaningful p-Celtic place-names in Bede's text—more, at any rate, than the transparently meaningful Irish place-names in the text: *Alcluith* ('rock of the Clyde'), *Aebbercurnig* ('mouth of the Cornie'), *Bancor* ('wattled fence'), *Carlegion* ('fortress of the legions'), *Mailmin* ('bare hill' or 'prince's edge'), *Mailros* ('blunt promontory' or 'bare moor'), and *Peanfahel* ('end of the wall', with an Irish second element).⁸³

By contrast with English and Irish names, there is no straightforward case of Bede translating a p-Celtic name. He did translate *Densisesburna*, whose first element seems etymologically to be p-Celtic (ultimately from Brittonic **dubno*- 'deep'); but Bede simply interpreted this as a personal name, inflecting as an Old English strong noun, so seems not to have recognised it as p-Celtic.⁸⁴ According to Bede, *Alcluith* "lingua eorum [Brettonum] significat petram Cluith; est enim iuxta fluuium nominis illius" ('in their [the Britons'] language means "rock of the Clyde," because it is next to a river of that name'; *HE* i.12). But in both *Alcluith* and *Cluith*, he gives not the Brittonic form (*Alt*) *Clut* (the etymon of the English name *Clyde*), but the Irish form *Cluith* (more properly *Cluithe*), while his sense *petra* for *al(t)*- is closer to the sense of Old Irish *ail* 'rock, boulder' than the medieval Brittonic sense of 'cliff, hill, slope, height; shore'.⁸⁵ Bede surely knew this word and its meaning through sources rooted in Irish rather than Brittonic language (whether Hiberno-Latin or Irish itself, spoken or written). This bolsters the evidence given above for his ability to translate Irish names and detracts from his ability (or willingness) to interpret Brittonic. The point may be supported by Bede's form *Mailros*, modern *Melrose*,

⁸³ *HE* i.1, 12, ii.2, 14, iii.26; Cox, "The Place-Names," 29, 31, 34; Fox, "The P-Celtic Place-Names," appendix s.vv. *Abercorn*, *Milfield*, *Melrose*; for *Alcluith* see below.

⁸⁴ Cox, "The Place-Names," 44.

⁸⁵ Jackson, *Language*, 309–310; *Dictionary of the Irish Language*, s.v. "ail"; *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymry*, s.v. "allt"; O. J. Padel, *Cornish Place-Name Elements*, English Place-Name Society 56–57 (Nottingham: English Place-Name Society, 1985), s.v. "als."

whose first element is etymologically the Brittonic **mailo-*, but which we would expect to see in Old English as *mēl-* or *māel-* because of the phonological history of the two languages: Jackson argued that rather than a (very) archaic form here, we have influence of the Irish cognate *mael*.⁸⁶ The Irish influence displayed here is also attested in the earlier, anonymous, Lindisfarne *Vita sancti Cuthberti*, emphasising that it was not unique to Bede.⁸⁷

Carlegion appears in a more confusing context, the sole occasion when Bede not only gives an English alternative to a Roman name, but also a Brittonic one (*HE* ii.2):

rex Anglorum fortissimus Aedilfrid collecto grandi exercitu ad ciuitatem Legionum, quae a gente Anglorum Legacaestir, a Brettonibus autem rectius Carlegion appellatur, maximam gentis perfidiae stragem dedit

[that most mighty king of the English Aedilfrid, after gathering a great army, wrought huge destruction of that faithless nation at *Ciuitas Legionum* [the city of legions], which is called *Legacaestir* by the people of the English, but more accurately *Carlegion* by the Britons].

This is one of Bede's clearest examples of anti-British rhetoric, but at the same time he concedes that the Welsh place-name *Carlegion* is 'more proper' (*rectius*) than the English *Legacaestir* on account of its greater similarity to the Roman Latin form *ciuitas Legionum*. Campbell suggested that this represents "interest in toponymy for its own sake," but even if so, it is surely also favourable to Welsh, if only as a specific concession motivated by *pietas* towards the Christian Roman past.⁸⁸ Conceivably one might read Bede here to be opposing the linguistic rectitude of the Welsh to their moral degradation—but the point hardly arises lucidly from Bede's phrasing. A possible alternative explanation is suggested by the prospect that *ciuitas legionum* was not an old Roman name, but an invention of Bede's; if so, Bede would have been inventing the name primarily on the basis of the vernacular names (taking the Welsh *legion* as the basis for *Legionum* and the English—*cæstir*, and perhaps the Welsh *car-*, as the basis for *civitas*), and may have wished to support his inference by emphasising *Carlegion*'s puta-

⁸⁶ Jackson, *Language*, 326–327.

⁸⁷ E.g., Colgrave, *The 'Lives'*, 78 (ch. 3); cf. Donald Bullough, "A Neglected Early-Ninth-Century Manuscript of the Lindisfarne *Vita S. Cuthberti*," *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998): 105–138, at 116–117.

⁸⁸ James Campbell, *The Anglo-Saxon State* (London: Hambledon, 2000), 141, n. 52.

tive proximity to the Latin.⁸⁹ If so, we perhaps have another example of ideological slippage in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, as Bede effectively concedes Britons' proximity to Britain's prestigious Roman heritage; it suggests that Felix's negative portrayal of Brittonic was not an entirely straightforward or uniform attitude even for Bede.⁹⁰

It is clear that we have relatively fewer p-Celtic names, if any, being glossed into Latin than Irish or English ones. One possible explanation for this would be simple ignorance of p-Celtic on Bede's part. If so, it would show that an early eighth-century English monk was more likely to know some Irish than what was probably the most widely spoken language apart from English in his kingdom. However, Bede might have chosen to make foreign-sounding Irish forms more familiar while suggesting the otherness of the Britons by leaving names in their language untranslated. That ignorance was at least involved is suggested by several factors. In the case of *Alcluith*, Bede does translate a p-Celtic form when it seems to be mediated through Irish. Moreover, Bede characterised the Picts as "gentem innoxiam, et nationi Anglorum semper amicissimam" ('a harmless people, and always very friendly towards the nation of the *Angli*;' *HE* iv.26) and generally presented them favourably. Bede specifies one place-name as being in the language of the Picts: *Peanfahel*. The second half of this word has been Gaelicised (from—*gwawl* 'wall' to the Irish cognate *fál*, in the genitive form *fáil*), creating a curious mixture (contrast Irish **cenn fháil*, the direct etymon of modern Kinneil, and the p-Celtic attestation *Penguaul*).⁹¹ Of all the p-Celtic names in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, one would most have expected Bede to explain *Peanfahel*, had he under-

⁸⁹ An interpretation voiced, apparently independently, by Smith, "Romano-British Place-Names," 6–7 and P. J. C. Field, "Gildas and the City of the Legions," *The Heroic Age* 1 (1999): <<http://www.heroicage.org>>. That Bede equated *civitas* and *cæstir* was shown by Campbell, "Bede's Words," 34–37.

⁹⁰ It is perhaps also worth noting that Bede's reference to the monastery at Whithorn, as "locus, ad prouinciam Berniciorum pertinens, uulgo uocatur Ad Candidam Casam, eo quod ibi ecclesiam de lapide, insolito Brettonibus more fecerit" (*HE* iii.4) could ostensibly refer to a translated British name (or even simply give a British Latin name). However, the earliest forms of the English name, Symeon of Durham's *Huuitern* (cited by Daphne Brooke, "The Northumbrian Settlements in Galloway and Carrick: An Historical Assessment," *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 121 (1991): 295–327, accessed from <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/PSAS_2002/pdf/vol_121/121_295_327.pdf> 30th April 2008, at 318), shows that it itself derives from *hwīt ærn* 'white building', so Bede's reference may only be to the English name.

⁹¹ Clancy, "Philosopher-King," 142.

stood it, because he names it as the place where the Antonine Wall starts, and the name indeed means ‘the head/end of the wall’. Indeed, in view of the fact that Kinneil today lies three or four kilometres to the west of the wall’s historic terminus, Dumville has argued that as

physical evidence for the line of the easternmost sector of the Wall disappeared, the name ‘End of the Wall’ (in whichever Celtic language) moved westward in pursuit of its monument.⁹²

This would emphasise the name’s continued transparency during the early Middle Ages. Admittedly, Bede seems for other reasons to have emphasised the otherness of the Picts, which might again have encouraged him not to translate a place-name of theirs (and conceivably to have given it in a linguistically hybrid form),⁹³ but equally, he seems to have made use of some Pictish sources, indicating, in Evans’s assessment, “a relatively high regard for Pictish scholarship.”⁹⁴ If nothing else, *Peanfahel* again suggests that Bede was learning his north British place-names through Irish-speakers (whether ethnically *Picti* or *Scotti*); nor does it discourage the inference that he could not understand Brittonic words.⁹⁵

Bede’s handling of etymologically Celtic place-names coheres with his anecdotal evidence to suggest a sociolinguistic context in earlier eighth-century Northumbria in which Irish was more familiar than p-Celtic dialects, and the medium in which information about

⁹² David Dumville, “The Eastern Terminus of the Antonine Wall: 12th- or 13th-Century Evidence,” *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 124 (1994): 293–298, accessed from <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/PSAS_2002/pdf/vol_124/124_293_298.pdf> April 9th 2008, at 297.

⁹³ Merrills, *History*, 283–286.

⁹⁴ Nicholas Evans, “The Calculation of Columba’s Arrival in Britain in Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* and the Pictish King-Lists,” *Scottish Historical Review* 88 (2008): 183–205, at 203.

⁹⁵ A further piece of evidence for Bede’s ignorance of p-Celtic would arise from the arguments of Thomas Clancy and James Fraser that the name of Saint Ninian (*HE* iii.4) is a scriabl error for the Brittonic *Uinniau (Clancy, “The Real St Ninian;” Fraser, “Northumbrian Whithorn”). If they are right, the misreading was probably not Bede’s own, but it is likely to have been that of another Northumbrian monk, and Bede clearly did not perceive an error. While one might envisage an Anglo-Saxon trying to detach the saint from his Brittonic cultural background by wilful minim-confusion, this would be an extreme course (and an informed Anglo-Saxon with this intention could have turned to Uinniau’s Hibernian identity as Finnian, or stressed his Roman identity, as Bede did with St Alban): the likelihood would be that it simply represents ignorance. That said, John MacQueen, *St Nynia* (Edinburgh: Donald, 2005), has resisted the reinterpretation of the name.

the northern p-Celtic-speaking regions was being transmitted to Northumbria. Before the establishment of English and Irish as major languages in Britain, Brittonic was already in competition with vulgar Latin, as shown by Latin influence on Welsh and the fate of the Celtic languages elsewhere in the Roman Empire. Later, however, p-Celtic languages were threatened rather by English and Irish, which came to replace them entirely in North Britain. This correlates with the hint that Bede was more familiar with British Latin than Brittonic, and with the fact that Irish is by far the most prominent competitor to English as a vernacular in the narrative material of the *Historia ecclesiastica*.

6. Conclusions

A (perhaps the) crucial factor in the competitiveness of a language is the way in which it is used in the home and the family (not necessarily co-terminous institutions in Anglo-Saxon England), and particularly in interaction between parents and children. Despite some fascinating glimpses into this sphere, however, it is probably fair to say that its history is beyond our reach for early medieval Britain.⁹⁶ What is not (entirely) beyond critical investigation today is the sociolinguistic history of public spheres: meetings, speeches, written texts and naming. A language's viability in public use is probably less crucial to its competitiveness than its viability as a home language,⁹⁷ but languages' prominence or usefulness in public discourse can still be a decisive factor in their competitiveness, particularly when multilingual people choose which language(s) to transmit to their children.⁹⁸ Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* offers a unique range of evidence for early medieval language contacts in Britain, including a number of stories and remarks about interlinguistic communication and the status of different languages, and a range of evidence for Anglo-Saxons' reception of place-names in the different languages of Britain. Admittedly,

⁹⁶ E.g., *HE* v.2, on John of Beverley healing a dumb youth; the Middle Welsh lullaby *Peis Dinogat*, which can plausibly be considered a North British composition roughly of Bede's time: Koch, *The 'Gododdin'*, 126–129, 233–234.

⁹⁷ Cf. Salikoko S. Mufwene, *The Ecology of Language Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 172–180.

⁹⁸ Cf. the insightful approaches of Alex Woolf, "Apartheid and Economics in Anglo-Saxon England," in *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Nick Higham, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 7 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 115–129, accessed from <<http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/history/staff/alexwoolf.html>>.

to say this is at one level a statement of our ignorance: Bede's evidence was shaped by a range of variables which we are ill-placed to control, and is accordingly susceptible of an extremely wide range of interpretations. All the same, he provides a glimpse of the processes of contact and change which allows us to qualify a history of language change in pre-Viking Britain otherwise constructed mainly on the basis of place-names.

Bede's concern about Anglo-Saxons' limited access to Latin is abundantly clear, but taken together, a number of hints also point towards his sensitivity to Roman and British Latin-language traditions in Britain. British Latin maintained features of vulgar Latin pronunciation as well as some distinctive semantics; Bede disliked both, but the fact that he saw fit to snipe at them in an aside may itself be evidence for the vigour of British Latin—and arguably for Bede's own anxiety at the fragility of Anglo-Saxons' Latin heritage relative to Britons' deeper traditions. Bede's evidence also suggests that British Latin was heard rather than merely read, and not only heard in the liturgy. However, we also have some evidence that by the decades around 700—whether more in Bede's time or the 660s is hard to guess—Latin would not have afforded its speakers much leverage at major ecclesiastical meetings in Northumbria, and perhaps also, therefore, in Irish-speaking regions. It seems that such meetings were, at least at times, being conducted in English and Irish, even when we might imagine Latin to have been a useful *lingua franca*. This does not tell us anything definite about the upper levels of Latinity in the early Anglo-Saxon and Irish churches, since the choice of language may have been influenced by the presence of less learned participants, but Bede also implies that it would be unsurprising for an Anglo-Saxon in an Irish monastery to learn Irish, suggesting the prevalence of vernacular languages in Irish and English ecclesiastical discourse at this time.

Thus although British Latinity may have been in better shape in Bede's time than surviving texts would suggest, this may not have much helped British clerics to advance their interests. Nor would Brittonic apparently serve clerics well. Grocock has said that "there is no evidence in Bedan writings... of Celtic languages being in common use in Northumbria in Bede's day," but I suggest that this can be mod-

ified.⁹⁹ Bede portrayed a seventh-century Northumbria in which Irish was not widely spoken, but in which it was probably widely heard. The past which he described, however, was one in which p-Celtic languages had no voice. Despite proving willing and able to translate significant numbers of English and Irish place-names, Bede almost never translates any of the numerous p-Celtic names in his work, even when writing about the Picts, towards whom he appears to have been well disposed. This evidence correlates broadly with the pejorative view of Brittonic expressed by the roughly contemporary *Vita Guthlaci*. Bede's evidence does not tell us anything about how widely p-Celtic dialects were still spoken in Northumbria in terms of space, either in his own time or in the times he described, but it does hint that to communicate with the Anglo-Saxon clerical elite, a p-Celtic speaker would probably have needed to use another language—whether English or, perhaps, Latin or Irish.

As this summary emphasises, Bede's evidence inevitably relates more to ecclesiastical life, the stress placed in potentially contemporaneous texts like the *Gododdin* elegies and *Beowulf* on reaping praise and being heard in council in the secular world being little represented. But there is a methodological virtue to be made of the necessity of borrowing Bede's ecclesiastical focus, and I will close by emphasising it: adducing ecclesiastical sources to the history of language-contact in early medieval Britain emphasises that churches and churchmen were not outside the mechanisms affecting the competitiveness of languages. The possible role of this section of society specifically in promoting linguistic change has not received much attention. However, according to chapter 17 of the *Vita Wilfridi*, Northumbrian kings gave "loca sancta in diversis regionibus, quae clerus Bryttonum, aciem gladii hostilis manu gentis nostrae fugiens, deseruit" ('holy places in various areas which the clergy of the Britons, fleeing the blade of the hostile sword wielded by the hand of our nation, deserted') to Bishop Wilfrid and his monastery at Ripon in and before the 670s.¹⁰⁰ A number of recent commentators have argued that this suggests that Wilfrid had an active role in extending English speakers' control over upland and western Northumbria.¹⁰¹ Likewise, the Ruthwell Cross, raised in

⁹⁹ Christopher Grocock, "Bede and the Golden Age of Latin Prose in Northumbria," in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. Jane Hawkes and Susan Mills (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), 371–382, at 371.

¹⁰⁰ Colgrave, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, 36.

¹⁰¹ Rollason, *Northumbria*, 100 and following note.

the eighth century in what is now Dumfriesshire, bearing a poetic Old English runic inscription, invites interpretation as a statement of Anglophone dominance of the ecclesiastical public sphere in a region which was at that time still in significant part Brittonic-speaking.¹⁰² Phythian-Adams inferred that

it seems inconceivable that at the end of the seventh century Cuthbert, for example, did not preach in their own language to those local people in whose midst he himself had been brought up in the British area of the Tweed basin

and Fox's recent toponymic work does not discourage the idea that there were many Brittonic-speakers in the region in Cuthbert's day.¹⁰³ But even if Cuthbert knew Brittonic, that does not mean that he chose to speak it. Churchmen could be major landowners; they organised and otherwise provoked public meetings of considerable import, offered desirable spiritual and educational services, and controlled the written word. Although we cannot be sure of how the usage spread, it is widely accepted as plausible that the promotion of the ethnic term *Angli* in Bede's scholarship had a direct effect on the development of ethnonyms in English.¹⁰⁴ The language-varieties favoured by nineteenth-century Christian missionaries affected the development of colonial languages and other *linguae francae*; the same may be true of their early medieval counterparts.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Fred Orton and Ian Wood with Clare Lees, *Fragments of History: Rethinking the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Monuments* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 121–139.

¹⁰³ Charles Phythian-Adams, *Land of the Cumbrians: A Study in British Provincial Origins A.D. 400–1120* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), 87; Fox, "The P-Celtic Place-Names."

¹⁰⁴ E.g., Richter, "Bede's *Angli*".

¹⁰⁵ E.g., Mufwene, *The Ecology*, 63–64.

Works Cited

- Adams, J. N. 1992. British Latin: The Text, Interpretation and Language of the Bath Curse Tablets. *Britannia* 23: 1–26.
- . 2002. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Adriaen, Marcus, ed. 1979–85. *S. Gregorii magni Moralia in Iob, Corpus Christianorum series Latina* 143, 143a, 143b, 3 vols. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Bartholomew, Philip. 2005. Continental Connections: Angles, Saxons and Others in Bede and in Procopius. *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 13: 19–30.
- Bracken, Damien. 2005. Virgil the Grammarian and Bede: A Preliminary Study. *Anglo-Saxon England* 36: 7–21, DOI 10.1017/S0263675106000020.
- Breatnach, Pádraig. 1988. The Pronunciation of Latin in Medieval Ireland. In *Scire litteras: Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben*, ed. Sigrid Krämer and Michael Bernhard, Abhandlungen (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse), neue Folge 99, 59–72. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Brooke, Daphne. 1991. The Northumbrian Settlements in Galloway and Carrick: An Historical Assessment. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 121: 295–327, accessed from <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/PSAS_2002/pdf/vol_121/121_295_327.pdf> 30th April 2008.
- Bullough, Donald. 1998. A Neglected Early-Ninth-Century Manuscript of the Lindisfarne *Vita S. Cuthberti*. *Anglo-Saxon England* 27: 105–138.
- Cameron, Angus, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey *et al.*, eds. 2007. *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* online. Toronto: DOE project. <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>>.
- Campbell, J. 1979. Bede's Words for Places. In *Names, Words, and Graves: Early Medieval Settlement. Lectures Delivered in the University of Leeds, May 1978*, ed. P. H. Sawyer, 34–54. Leeds: The School of History, University of Leeds (repr. in *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London: Hambledon Press, 1986), 99–119).
- Campbell, James. 2000. *The Anglo-Saxon State*. London: Hambledon.
- Cavill, Paul Cavill. 2002. Bede and Cædmon's Hymn. In *'Lastworda Betst': Essays in Memory of Christine E. Fell with her Unpublished Writings*, ed. Carole Hough and Kathryn A. Lowe, 1–17. Donington: Tyas.
- Charles Edwards, T. M. 2000. *Early Christian Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christiansen, Reidar Th. 1962. The People of the North. *Lochlann: A Review of Celtic Studies 2/Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap*, supplementary volume 6: 137–164.
- Clancy, Thomas Owen. 2001. The Real St Ninian. *The Innes Review* 52: 1–28.
- . Philosopher-King: Nechtan mac Der-Ilei. *The Scottish Historical Review* 83: 125–149.
- Coates, Richard. 2005. Verulamium, the Romano-British Name of St Albans. *Studia Celtica* 39: 169–76.
- . 2007. Invisible Britons: The View from Linguistics. In *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Nick Higham, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 7, pp. 172–91. Woodbridge: Boydell. Working paper available at <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/linguistics/documents/rc_britons.pdf>.
- Cohen, Jeffrey J. 2003. *Medieval Identity Machines*, Medieval Cultures 35. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Colgrave, Bertram, ed. 1927. *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , ed. 1940. *Two 'Lives' of Saint Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- , ed. 1968. *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great, by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.
- and R. A. B. Mynors, ed. 1991. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, corrected reprint. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cox, Barrie. 1975–76. The Place-Names of the Earliest English Records. *Journal of the English Place-Name Society* 8: 12–66.
- Crépin, André. 1976. Bede and the Vernacular. In *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede*, ed. Gerald Bonner, 170–192. London: SPCK.
- Cubitt, Catherine. 1995. *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils c. 650–c. 850*. London: Leicester University Press.
- Dailey, Erin Thomas A. Forthcoming. The *Vita Wilfridi* and the *Vita Gregorii*: Their Place in Early English Ethnogenesis.
- Derolez, René. 1992. Language Problems in Anglo-Saxon England: *barbara loquella* and *barbarismus*. In *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Korhammer, 285–292. Cambridge: Brewer.
- Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. 1975–. London: Oxford University Press.
- Dictionary of the Irish Language: Based Mainly on Old and Middle Irish Materials*. 1913–75. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, available at <<http://www.dil.ie>>.
- Doane, A. N., ed. 1978. *Genesis A: A New Edition*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.
- Dobbie, Elliott Van Kirk, ed. 1942. *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 6. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dumville, David. 1994. The Eastern Terminus of the Antonine Wall: 12th- or 13th-Century Evidence. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 124: 293–298, accessed from <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/PSAS_2002/pdf/vol_124/124_293_298.pdf> April 9th 2008.
- Ehwald, Rudolf, ed. 1919. *Aldhelmi Opera*, Monumenta Germanicae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 15, 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, available at <<http://www.dmgh.de>>.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2008. The Calculation of Columba's Arrival in Britain in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and the Pictish King-Lists. *Scottish Historical Review* 88: 183–205.
- Field, P. J. C. 1999. Gildas and the City of the Legions. *The Heroic Age* 1: <<http://www.heroicage.org>>.
- Filppula, Markku, Juhani Klemola and Heli Pitkänen, ed. 2002. *The Celtic Roots of English*, Studies in Languages 37. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Humanities.
- Forsyth, Katherine. 1998. Literacy in Pictland. In *Literacy in Medieval Celtic Societies*, ed. Huw Pryce, 39–61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, available at <<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/2461>>.
- . 2005. *Hic memoria perpetua*: The Early Inscribed Stones of Southern Scotland in Context. In *Able Minds and Practised Hands: Scotland's Early Medieval Sculpture in the 21st Century*, ed. Sally M. Foster and Morag Cross, The Society for Medieval Archaeology, Monographs 23, 113–134. Leeds: The Society for Medieval Archaeology.
- Fox, Bethany. 2007. The P-Celtic Place-Names of North-East England and South-East Scotland. *The Heroic Age* 10: <<http://www.heroicage.org>>.
- Fraser, James E. 2002. Northumbrian Whithorn and the Making of St Ninian. *The Innes Review* 53: 40–59.
- . 2006. Dux Reuda and the Corcu Réti. In *Cànan & Cultur/Language and Culture: Rannsachadh na Gàighlig* 3, ed. Wilson McLeod, James E. Fraser and Anja Gunderloch, 1–9. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.

- Fulk, R. D. 1992. *A History of Old English Meter*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru/A Dictionary of the Welsh Language. 1950–2003. Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Goffart, Walter. 1988. *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550–800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2006. Bede's History in a Harsher Climate. In *Innovation and Tradition in the Writings of the Venerable Bede*, ed. Scott DeGregorio, *Medieval European Studies* 6, 203–26. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press.
- Paul Gosner, ed. 1909. *Das angelsächsische Prosa-Leben des hl. Guthlac*, *Anglistische Forschungen* 27. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Grocock, Christopher. 1999. Bede and the Golden Age of Latin Prose in Northumbria. In *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. Jane Hawkes and Susan Mills, 371–382. Stroud: Sutton.
- Hall, Alaric. 2007. Constructing Anglo-Saxon Sanctity: Tradition, Innovation and Saint Guthlac. In *Images of Sanctity: Essays in Honour of Gary Dickson*, ed. Debra Higgs Strickland, *Visualising the Middle Ages* 1, 207–235. Leiden: Brill, available at <<http://www.alarichall.org.uk>>.
- . Working paper. The Evidence of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* for the Replacement of Roman Place-Names by English ones during the Anglo-Saxon Period. Available at <<http://www.alarichall.org.uk>>.
- Harvey, Anthony. 1990. Notes on Old Irish and Old Welsh Consonantal Spelling. In *Celtic Linguistics/Ieithyddiaeth Geltaidd: Readings in the Brythonic Languages. Festschrift for T. Arwyn Watkins*, ed. Martin J. Ball, James Fife, Erich Poppe and Jenny Rowland, *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series IV: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 68, 403–410. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- . 1990. Retrieving the Pronunciation of Early Insular Celtic Scribes: Towards and Methodology. *Celtica* 21 (1990): 178–190, available at <<http://www.celt.dias.ie/publications/celtica>>.
- Higham, Nicholas. 1992. *Rome, Britain and the Anglo-Saxons*. London: Seaby.
- . 2001. Britons in Northern England in the Early Middle Ages: Through a Thick Glass Darkly. *Northern History* 38 (2001): 5–25.
- . 1997. *The Convert Kings: Power and Religious Affiliation in Early Anglo-Saxon England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 2006. *(Re-)Reading Bede: The 'Ecclesiastical History' in Context*. London: Routledge.
- . 2004. From Sub-Roman Britain to Anglo-Saxon England: Debating the Insular Dark Ages. *History Compass* 2 (2004): 1–29, DOI: 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2004.00085.x.
- . 2007. Britons in Anglo-Saxon England: An Introduction. In *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Nick Higham, *Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies* 7, 1–15. Woodbridge: Boydell.
- , ed. 2007. *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, *Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies* 7. Woodbridge: Boydell.
- Holder-Egger, O., ed. 1887. *Luidgeri vita Gregorii Abbatis Traiectensis*, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores* (in folio) 15 part 1. Hannover: Hahn, available at <<http://www.dmgh.de>>.
- Hurst, D., ed. 1962. *Beda's Venerabilis opera pars II: opera exegetica 2. In primam partem Samvhelis libri III; In regvm librvm XXX qvaetiones*, *Corpus Christianorum, series Latina* 119. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Ireland, Colin. 1991. Aldfrith of Northumbria and the Irish Genealogies. *Celtica* 22 (1991): 64–78, accessed from <<http://www.celt.dias.ie/publications/celtica>> April 1st 2008.

- Ireland, Colin A. (ed. and trans.). 1999. *Old Irish Wisdom Attributed to Aldfrith of Northumbria: An Edition of Briatha Flainn Fhina maic Ossu*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 205. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.
- Jackson, Kenneth Hurstone. 1953. *Language and History in Early Britain: A Chronological Survey of the Brittonic Languages, First to Twelfth Century A.D.*, University of Edinburgh Publications, Languages and Literature Series 4. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jones, C. W., ed. 1967. *Bedae venerabilis opera, pars II: opera exegetica 1. Libri quatuor in principium Genesis usque ad nativitatem Isaac et eiectionem Ismahelis adnotatio-num*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 118a. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 1975–77. *De temporum ratione XV (Bedae venerabilis opera, Pars VI: Opera Didascalica*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 123a, 123b, 2 vols. Turnhout: Brepols.
- John Thomas Koch. 1997. *The 'Gododdin' of Aneirin: Text and Context from Dark-Age North Britain*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Lapidge, Michael. 2007. The Career of Aldhelm. *Anglo-Saxon England* 36: 15–69, DOI: 10.1017/S0263675100000028.
- MacQueen, John. 2005. *St Nynia*. Edinburgh: Donald.
- McClure, Judith. 1985. Bede's *Notes on Genesis* and the Training of the Anglo-Saxon Clergy. In *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood, 17–30. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mehan, Uppinder and David Townsend. 2001. 'Nation' and the Gaze of the Other in Eighth-Century Northumbria," *Comparative Literature* 53 (2001): 1–26.
- Menzer, Melinda J. 2002. Speaking Brittonice: Vowel Quantities and Musical Length in Ælfric's *Grammar*. *Peritia*, 16: 26–39.
- Merrills, A. H. 2005. *History and Geography in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Okasha, Elizabeth. 1971. *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1983. A Supplement to *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*. *Anglo-Saxon England* 11: 83–118.
- . 1992. A Second Supplement to *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*. *Anglo-Saxon England* 21: 37–85.
- . 2005. A Third Supplement to *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*. *Anglo-Saxon England* 33: 225–81.
- Oliver, Lisi. 2002. *The Beginnings of English Law*, Toronto Medieval Texts and Translations 14. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Orchard, Andy. 2003. Latin and the Vernacular: The Creation of a Bilingual Textual Culture. In *After Rome*, ed. Thomas Charles-Edwards, 191–219. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Orton, Fred and Ian Wood with Clare Lees. 2007. *Fragments of History: Rethinking the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Monuments*, 121–139. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Padel, O. J. 1985. *Cornish Place-Name Elements*, English Place-Name Society 56–57. Nottingham: English Place-Name Society.
- Pheifer, J. D. 1987. Early Anglo-Saxon Glossaries and the School of Canterbury. *Anglo-Saxon England* 16: 17–44.
- Phythian-Adams, Charles. 1996. *Land of the Cumbrians: A Study in British Provincial Origins A.D. 400–1120*. Aldershot: Scolar Press.
- Plummer, Charles. 1896. *Venerabilis Baedae Historiam ecclesiam gentis Anglorum, Historiam abbatum, Epistolam ad Ecgberhtum una cum Historia abbatum auctore anonymo*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Pohl, Walter. 1998. "Telling the Difference: Signs of Ethnic Identity," in *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300–800*, ed. Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz, The Transformation of the Roman World 2, 17–69. Leiden: Brill.
- Probert, Duncan. 2007. Mapping Early Medieval Language Change in South-West England. In *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Nick Higham, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 7, 231–44. Woodbridge: Boydell.
- Remley, Paul G. 1996. *Old English Biblical Verse: Studies in 'Genesis', 'Exodus' and 'Daniel'*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richter, Michael. 1984. Bede's *Angli*: Angles or English? *Peritia* 3: 99–114.
- Rivet, A. L. F. and Colin Smith. 1979. *The Place-Names of Roman Britain*. London: Batsford.
- Roberts, Jane. 2001. Hagiography and Literature: The Case of Guthlac of Crowland. In *Mercia: An Anglo-Saxon Kingdom in Europe*, ed. Michelle P. Brown and Carol A. Farr, 69–86. London: Leicester University Press.
- Rollason, David. 2003. *Northumbria, 500–1100: Creation and Destruction of a Kingdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schrijver, Peter. 2002. The Rise and Fall of British Latin: Evidence from English and Brittonic. In *The Celtic Roots of English*, ed. Markku Filppula, Juhani Klemola and Heli Pitkänen, Studies in Languages 37, 87–110. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Humanities.
- Smith, Colin. 1979. Romano-British Place-Names in Bede. *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 1 (= B.A.R. British Series 72, ed. Sonia Chadwick Hawkes, David Brown and James Campbell: 1–19.
- Smith, Julia M. H. 2005. *Europe after Rome: A New Cultural History 500–1000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Speed, Diane. 2005. Bede's Mapping of England. In *Travel and Travellers from Bede to Dampier*, ed. Geraldine Barnes and Gabrielle Singleton, 9–23. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, accessed from <<http://www.c-s-p.org/Flyers/9781904303510-sample.pdf>> April 30th 2008.
- Stancliffe, Clare. 1999. The British Church and the Mission of Augustine. In *St Augustine and the Conversion of England*, ed. Richard Gameson, 107–51. Stroud: Sutton.
- Stanton, Robert. 2006. Linguistic Fragmentation and Redemption before King Alfred. *The Yearbook of English Studies* 36: 12–26.
- Thacker, Alan. 1998. Memorializing Gregory the Great: The Origin and Transmission of a Papal Cult in the Seventh and Early Eighth Centuries. *Early Medieval Europe* 7: 59–84, DOI: 10.1111/1468–0254.00018.
- Timofeeva, Olga. 2010. Anglo-Latin Bilingualism before 1066: Prospects and Limitations. In *Interfaces between Language and Culture in Medieval England: A Festschrift for Matti Kilpiö*, ed. Alaric Hall, Agnes Kiricsi and Olga Timofeeva with Bethany Fox, The Northern World 48. Leiden: Brill.
- Tristram, Hildegard L. C. Von, ed. 1997–2003. *The Celtic Englishes*, Anglistische Forschungen 247, 286, 324, 3 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Tugene, Georges. 2001. *L'idée de nation chez Bède le Vénérable*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Moyen Âge et Temps Modernes 37. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes.
- Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. 1988. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People: A Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, Robert, ed. 1975. *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, 2nd rev. ed., 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt.
- Wilcox, Jonathan, ed. 1994. *Ælfric's Prefaces*, Durham Medieval Texts 9. Durham: Durham Medieval Texts.

- , ed. 2000. *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile: Volume 8, Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 219. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.
- Woolf, Alex. 2004. Caedwalla Rex Brettonum and the Passing of the Old North. *Northern History* 41: 1–20.
- . 2007. Apartheid and Economics in Anglo-Saxon England. In *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Nick Higham, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 7, 115–129. Woodbridge: Boydell, accessed from <<http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/history/staff/alexwoolf.html>>.
- . *From Pictland to Alba*, The New Edinburgh History of Scotland 2. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wright, Roger. *A Sociophilological Study of Late Latin*, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 10. Turnhout, Brepols, 2002.

QUAE NON HABET INTELLECTUM:
THE DISAPPEARANCE OF FIFTH-FOOT SPONDEES FROM
DACTYLIC HEXAMETER VERSE

Seppo Heikkinen
University of Helsinki

1. *Introduction*

The dactylic hexameter was the most frequently used of the classical Greek and Roman metres. It was praised by ancient and medieval authors alike for its versatility, being suited to both lofty and common subjects. The vast amount of hexameter poetry in various genres testifies to this quality: it was used not only by the epic poets, but also by satirists and composers of didactic works, not to mention in commemorative inscriptions and graffiti. It also appears in the longer lines of elegiac couplets and forms a part of several different lyric stanza-types.

Although the popularity of the quantitative classical metres in general began to wane in the Middle Ages, the hexameter retained its former prestige, having been adopted for such new and quintessentially medieval genres as verse hagiography. The medieval form of the hexameter generally remained remarkably faithful to its classical models: although rhymes were often applied to the metre, attempts to compose rhythmic, or non-quantitative, hexameter poetry seem to have been remarkably rare. The hexameter remained a touchstone for poets because of the unusual demands it made on their learning: as spoken Latin had lost its syllable quantities, mastering the long and short syllables of quantitative verse required a long and strenuous apprenticeship. This also partly explains the great interest that grammarians and composers of metrical treatises showed in the dactylic hexameter, and their tendency to err on the conservative side in their views on it from time to time.

The dactylic hexameter is a quantitative metre that consists of long and short syllables. It has six feet, with either a dactyl (long-short-short) or a spondee (long-long) in the first four, generally a dactyl in the fifth, and a spondee or trochee (long-short) in the sixth. As

I have stated, the fifth foot of the hexameter line is generally—but not always—a dactyl. Lines with fifth-foot spondees are unusual to the extent of having acquired a name of their own, being called *spondeiazontes* or *spondiaci*, or, in English, spondaic verses.

This article investigates Anglo-Saxons' attitudes to spondaic verses, contextualising them within the earlier history of Latin hexameter verse before investigating the ideas and influence of the Anglo-Saxon authors Aldhelm and Bede. Spondaic verses have a very distinctive character: they lack the “dum-di-di-dum-dum” cadence that for most people, presumably even in antiquity, is the most recognisable part of the hexameter line. This may be why hexameter poets have always tended to either use these verses very sparingly or eschew them altogether. They were more common in Greek literature than among the Romans, and after Vergil, they became increasingly rare in Latin poetry, to the point of virtual disappearance in the Middle Ages, a trend reflected in the views medieval grammarians took on the structure. Aldhelm and Bede were markedly hostile towards fifth-foot spondees, the latter to the point of virtual disbelief in their existence, and these views appear to have profoundly affected subsequent generations of poets.

2. *The dactylic hexameter: early history*

The roots of the dactylic hexameter extend as far back as the oral epic traditions of the Greeks, and possibly even earlier. It has been pointed out that the metre is rather different from other forms of epic verse known to the Indo-European peoples, and it has even been suggested that its origins may not be Indo-European at all.¹ Whatever the case may be, in its original form, the hexameter may have been purely dactylic, and the substitution of spondees for dactyls may have been an innovation, necessitated by the prosodic structure of the Greek language.²

As the dactylic hexameter came into Roman usage around 200 BC, further adjustments had to be made to its structure in order to accommodate a different prosodic system. One such adjustment was a sub-

¹ Antoine Meillet, *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1923), 57.

² C. M. J. Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2/4 (Munich: Beck, 1993), 70–71.

stantial increase in the number of spondaic feet. Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the first major works of hexameter poetry, are also among the most highly dactylic. A prime specimen is the opening line of the *Odyssey*:

Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ

[Tell me, o Muse, of the man of many devices.]

where all of the first five feet are dactylic. Of all the combinations of dactyls and spondees, this so-called holodactylic type is the most common in Homer's poetry, constituting over 20 per cent of all his lines.³ Although several later Greek poets were more ponderous and preferred a more liberal use of spondaic feet, Greek hexameter poetry remained very highly dactylic until late antiquity.⁴

The dactyl-spondee ratio was one of the issues on which the pioneers of Roman hexameter poetry had to make some compromises when they adopted this foreign metre for their own use. For several historical reasons, long syllables are considerably more common in Latin than in Greek, which often made the use of dactyls impracticable. Quintus Ennius, the first Latin hexameter poet, solved the problem by changing a primarily dactylic metre into a predominantly spondaic one.⁵ The result was a form of hexameter poetry that was heavier than anything conceived by the Greek poets, though it undeniably had *gravitas*. A good example is a fragment of Ennius' annals in which king Pyrrhus states his terms to the enemy:

Nec m(i) aurum poscō nec mī pretium dederītis:
nōn caupōnantēs bellum sed belligerantēs,
ferrō, nōn aurō, vītā cernāmus utrīque⁶

[I do not ask for gold or ransom;
let us fight the war, not bargain for it,
and decide our fates with swords, not with gold.]

All the lines have the same pattern: four spondees followed by a dactyl and a spondee or a trochee. This was Ennius' favourite line-pattern,

³ George E. Duckworth, *Vergil and Classical Hexameter Poetry. A study in Metrical Variety* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1969), 37.

⁴ Duckworth, *Vergil*, table 3.

⁵ David S. Raven, *Latin Metre* (London: Faber and Faber, 1965), 91; Duckworth, *Vergil*, 37.

⁶ Enn. ann. 183–185. The line numbers correspond with *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, ed. Otto Skutsch (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

and although subsequent generations of poets did their best to develop the hexameter in a more dactylic, and less repetitive, direction, the Roman hexameter persistently remained more spondaic than its Greek counterpart.

3. *Fifth-foot structure: dactyls vs. spondees*

There was, however, one prominent exception to the tendency of Latin hexameter poetry to be more spondaic than Greek—the fifth foot of the hexameter. Even in the earliest Greek hexameter poetry, lines with a spondee in the fifth foot, or spondaic verses, are relatively rare, constituting only about five percent of all lines.⁷ Some Greek hexameter poets, however, found more use for them. Perhaps the most celebrated example is the opening of Hesiod's *Works and Days*. The spondaic fifth foot adds to the line's air of slow majesty:

Μοῦσαι Πιερίηθεν, ἀοιδῆισι κλείουσai

[Pierian Muses, praising with your songs].

Later, such lines became a favourite device of the Alexandrian poets Theocritus and Callimachus.

In Latin hexameter poetry, spondaic fifth feet were, from the very outset, much rarer.⁸ Of the extant hexameter lines of Ennius, only one in fifty lines has a fifth-foot spondee,⁹ and over the course of time, such lines gradually fell more and more into disuse. This is one of the most intriguing differences between Greek and Roman hexameter technique: if the Roman poets were, on the whole, so much more spondaic than their Greek predecessors, why did they eschew spondees in the fifth foot? The question contains its own answer: in a metre that in principle was dactylic but in practice mainly consisted of spondees, a dactylic fifth foot was required to make the metre recognisable. Some of Ennius' own lines show us what can happen when this is not observed:

Olli respondit rēx Albāi Longāi¹⁰

[The King of Alba Longa replied to him].

⁷ Duckworth, *Vergil*, table 3; Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre*, 74.

⁸ Raven, *Latin Metre*, 92.

⁹ Duckworth, *Vergil*, table 1.

¹⁰ Enn. ann. 31.

Intrödūcuntur lēgātī Minturnēnsēs¹¹

[The Minturnese delegates are brought in].

The lines contain no dactyls, and were it not for their original context, it would be hard to tell that they are hexameter lines at all. In a hexameter line with a pronouncedly spondaic beginning, the fifth-foot dactyl was essential to reassert the nature of the metre.

There were, however, circumstances under which a spondaic fifth foot proved useful. Because it was unusual and perceived to be somewhat at odds with the fundamental nature of the dactylic metre, it could be used to striking effect by a bold poet, often to convey an image of heaviness:¹²

Proximus huic, longō sed proximus intervallō¹³

[Nearest, but still a long distance away].

Fifth-foot spondees could also be used in emulation of Greek poetry, and they are one of the metrical mannerisms that the neoteric Catullus chose to affect, echoing Theocritus and Callimachus:¹⁴

Ēlēctōs iuvenēs simul et decus innūptārum¹⁵

[Chosen youths and the very best of unmarried girls].

As a user of fifth-foot spondees, Catullus is unparalleled in the history of Latin poetry, exceeding even most of the Greek poets (he uses one on average every 13.6 lines), and no other poet followed his example.¹⁶

All the same, the spondaic fifth foot remained associated with Greek imagery. It could be used in conjunction with Greek words or names:

¹¹ Enn. ann. dubia 9.

¹² Raven, *Latin Metre*, 92; Louis Nougaret, *Traité de métrique latine classique* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1948), 46, also suspects that Ennius and Lucretius may have used the spondaic line to suggest “une certaine gaucherie”. There may, admittedly, be an element of parody in such lines as Ennius’ “Ollī respondit rēx Albāi Longāi” or “Intrödūcuntur lēgātī Minturnēnsēs,” where the metrical heaviness can be thought to reflect the pomposity of the characters portrayed by the lines.

¹³ Verg. Aen. 5.320.

¹⁴ L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 225; Raven, *Latin Metre*, 92.

¹⁵ Catull. 64.78.

¹⁶ Duckworth, *Vergil*, table 1.

Flāvit ab Ēpīrō lēnissimus Onchesmītēs¹⁷

[The gentle breeze blew from Epirus].

Margine terrārum porrēxerat Amphitrītē¹⁸

[(Nor had) Amphitrite stretched out (her arms) along the edge of the lands].

It could also be used to evoke images of Greek things in general or suggest an air of oriental languor and effeminacy, a practice reflected in the remarks of Quintilian, who characterised such cadences as weak (“*praemolle*”).¹⁹ In such cases, the spondaic fifth foot often appears in conjunction with other unusual or Greek-sounding metrical phenomena such as hiatus (the absence of elision of final vowels before the initial vowel of the following word):²⁰

Stant et iūniperī // et castaneae // hirsūtae²¹

[The junipers stand with the shaggy chestnut trees].

Often, at least in the poetry of Vergil, lines with such metrical Graecisms are direct paraphrases of Greek lines.

As the fifth-foot spondee was relegated to this role of special effect, some further restrictions were imposed upon it: starting with Lucretius, fifth-foot spondees are always preceded by a dactyl in the fourth foot, and word-division is strenuously avoided between fifth and sixth feet, to avoid the creation of a false cadence. In developed hexameter

¹⁷ Cic. Att. 7.2. This line in Cicero’s letter to Atticus is intended to parody the style of Catullus and the Neoteric poets. Cicero goes on: “hunc *spondeiazonta* si cui voles *ton neoteron* pro tuo vendito” (‘you can sell this *spondeiazon* as one of your own to any of the new poets’).

¹⁸ Ovid. *metam.* 1.14.

¹⁹ Quint. *inst.* 9, 4, 65:

Est in eo quoque nonnihil, quod hic singulis verbis bini pedes continentur, quod etiam in carminibus est *praemolle*, nec solum ubi quinae, ut in his, syllabae nec-tuntur, “*fortissima Tyndaridārum*” (Hor. *sat.* 1, 1, 100), sed etiam quaternae, cum versus cluditur “*Appenninō*” et “*armāmentis*” et “*Ōriōne*.”

[There is also something in the fact that here two feet are included in one word, something that is excessively weak even in verse, not only when a word of five syllables ends a verse, as *fortissima Tyndaridārum*, but even when the concluding word consists of but four syllables, as *Appenninō*, *armāmentis*, *Ōriōne*.]

Quintilian equates a spondaic ending consisting of one quadrisyllabic word with a line-ending consisting of a single pentasyllable (dactyl + spondee). Quintilian’s main target here, however, is Cicero’s prosodically similar prose clausulae.

²⁰ Raven, *Latin Metre*, 101.

²¹ Verg. *Ecl.* 7.53.

poetry, lines with spondaic fifth feet almost invariably ended with a four-syllable word.²²

4. *After the Augustans*

The fifth-foot spondee's gradual disappearance can be observed in the statistics compiled by George E. Duckworth in his *Vergil and Classical Hexameter Poetry*. In Ennius, we have one fifth-foot spondee per 51.5 lines; in Lucretius, one per 230.2 lines; and in Vergil's *Aeneid*, one per 409.5 lines. Horace seems to have been particularly averse to spondaic fifth feet: his satires have none at all, and his *Epistles* and *Ars Poetica* only have one each.²³

Among the poets of the silver age and late empire, we encounter even lower frequencies of fifth-foot spondees: one every 618 lines in Lucan, one every 1,387 lines in Statius's *Thebais*, and one every 5,586 lines in Valerius Flaccus. Admittedly, some of the late authors show comparatively high frequencies of spondaic fifth feet (one per 109.1. lines in the silver age Juvenal and one per 134.3 lines in the early Christian Prudentius), but at least an equal number of late Latin poets gave them up altogether: Corippus, Proba, Paulinus of Périgueux, Dracontius, Cyprianus and Arator have no spondaic fifth feet at all.²⁴

This tendency may reflect a general increase in the rigidity of poetic structures. As the hexameter line became more formalised, quirks like the unusual cadences that the Augustan poets employed from time to time, albeit cautiously and tastefully, were no longer willingly tolerated. We can assume two further reasons for the spondaic fifth foot's disappearance: the decline of Greek letters in the western parts of the empire,²⁵ and the prosodic changes that took place in late antiquity.

²² Nougaret, *Traité de métrique*, 45–46; Hans Drexler, *Einführung in die römische Metrik* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967), 85–86. The most notable exceptions in Vergil are the aforementioned *castaneae hirsutae* (ecl. 7, 53) and *cum magnis dis* (Aen. 8, 679), which is a direct loan from Pyrrhus' speech in Enn. ann. 190.

²³ Duckworth, *Vergil*, table 1.

²⁴ Duckworth, *Vergil*, table 1.

²⁵ This is discussed extensively in Pierre Courcelle, *Late Latin Writers and Their Greek Sources*, trans. Harry E. Wedeck (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), esp. at 410–421.

We noted previously that spondaic fifth feet were commonly used in imitation of Greek models or in evocation of Greek themes. As the Greek hexameter poets, whom the early Roman poets had emulated, fell more and more into obscurity in the West, the traditional allusions of *spondeiazontes* were likely to be lost on readers. This may have led to a loss of prestige for this metrical structure, which is perhaps best illustrated by a line from the *Vita Sancti Martini* of Venantius Fortunatus, sometimes called the last Roman poet. It is the only line with a spondaic fifth foot in this 2,243-line verse hagiography, and describes a cow kneeling before St. Martin:

Flexit et ipsa genū, quae nōn habet intellēctum²⁶

[Even she who has no intellect knelt down].

The line is one of Venantius's metrical jokes: the heavy fifth-foot spondee reflects the slow wit and great weight of the animal. Divested of its associations with higher learning, the heavy spondaic line-ending had become for Venantius a vehicle of parody, suitable for the portrayal of brute beasts.

The virtual demise of the fifth-foot spondee may also reflect the changes in syllable quantity in late Latin, which undermined the very basis of the classical poetic metres.²⁷ Poets had to rely more and more on the authority of previous generations of poets in questions of prosody, and syllable quantity had to be gleaned from pre-existing lines. This cramped the artistic freedom of late antique and early medieval poets and made unorthodox metrical solutions unfeasible, which, in turn, contributed to the critical view the Anglo-Saxon authors Aldhelm and Bede took on the spondaic fifth foot.

5. *The Anglo-Saxon Age: Aldhelm*

The Anglo-Saxons are acknowledged as the first non-Romance people to compose Latin poetry in quantitative metres, and this they did, on the whole, very well, despite the rather intimidating challenges presented by the quantitative prosodic system, which must have seemed

²⁶ Ven. Fort. Mart. 3.315.

²⁷ See Dag Norberg, *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale*, Acta universitatis Stockholmiensis, Studia Latina Stockholmensia 5 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1958), 7–28.

obscure and alien to the early Anglo-Saxon scholars.²⁸ The earliest metrical treatises composed by Anglo-Saxons for Anglo-Saxons include Aldhelm's *De metris* and *De pedum regulis* and, most notably, Bede's *De arte metrica*. Both Bede and Aldhelm deal extensively with syllable quantity and methods of determining it, relying heavily on word-lists, mnemonics and the examples provided by earlier poets. In doing this, they continued the tradition of the late antique grammarians. This is reflected in Aldhelm's own verse technique as well: his lines are, in Andy Orchard's words, "almost wholly cobbled together from a combination of repeated phrases, both borrowed and newly coined."²⁹ Aldhelm's poetry is exceedingly formulaic, and many of his lines are composed of three distinct building-blocks: a combination of two dactyls or spondees and one long syllable, a molossus (a word or word combination of three long syllables), and a final cadence formed from a dactyl and a spondee or a trochee.³⁰ With careful substitution and permutation, this formula could be used to generate countless new, if somewhat repetitive, hexameter lines. In practice, this approach precluded all but the most predictable prosodic structures.

In his *De metris*, a dialogue-form treatise on the basic poetic structures, Aldhelm expressly says that, of the six feet of the hexameter line, the first five can be either dactyls or spondees. He is, however, highly critical of the spondaic fifth foot, characterising it as uncouth: "minus lenis est versus, qui quinto loco spondeum habuerit" ('a line with a spondee in the fifth foot is less smooth').³¹ He also quotes an

²⁸ Andy Orchard, *The Poetic Art of Aldhelm*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 8 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 74.

²⁹ Orchard, *Poetic Art*, 111.

³⁰ Michael Lapidge, "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse," *Comparative Literature* 31 (1979): 209–231, at 221–223; Andy Orchard, "After Aldhelm: The Teaching and Transmission of the Anglo-Latin Hexameter," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 2 (1992): 96–133, at 102. A good example of this structure is a passage from Aldhelm's *Carmen de Virginitate* (Aldhelm, *Opera*, ed. Rudolf Ehwald, MGH AA 15 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1919), lines 44–48; translation from Aldhelm, *The Poetic Works*, trans. Michael Lapidge and James Rosier (Cambridge: Brewer, 1985), 104):

Omnia regnandō / dispēnsat / saecula simplex
ēn prōmissa novō / scribantur / carmina versū
garrula virgineās / dēprōmat / pāgina laudēs
cōlaque cum pedibus / pergant et / commata ternīs.

[(God) guides in rule all generations as one. Behold, let these promised songs be composed in new verse! Let the fluent page issue praise of virgins, and let the clauses and caesuras of the verse proceed with three types of foot.]

³¹ Aldhelm, *Opera*, 83.

Ennian line with no dactyls at all, and warns his reader: “quod genus versificationis adeo durum et horrens est, ut Albinus...vetet” (‘this form of versification is so hard and rough that Albinus...forbids it’).³² Aldhelm’s reference to the obscure grammarian Albinus comes from the grammarian Audax, on whose *Fragmenta* Aldhelm draws very heavily in his *De metris*.³³

For reasons unknown, Aldhelm seems to have a strangely ambiguous attitude to the spondaic fifth foot. Although in his initial definition of the hexameter he grudgingly admits that it may be used, he elsewhere decrees that the fifth foot must be a dactyl: “nec in fine dactilus poni debet nec spondeus in quinto loco” (‘one must never place a dactyl at the end of a line or a spondee in the fifth foot’).³⁴ Aldhelm himself appears to have always followed this rule,³⁵ except—and this is hardly to be believed—in the self-same *De metris*. To demonstrate all the possible permutations of a hexameter line that contains exactly three dactyls, Aldhelm presents his reader with no less than ten lines, four of which have the inevitable spondee in the fifth foot:³⁶

Iam veneranda Deī sobolēs mundum salvāvit

[God’s venerable progeny saved the world];

Iam memoranda Deī prōlēs cruce salvat saecula

[God’s memorable offspring saves the world on the cross];

In cruce suspēnsus sine crimine salvat mundum

[Hanging on the cross without crime, He saves the world];

Mundum iam veneranda Deī sobolēs salvāvit

[God’s venerable progeny saved the world].

Some might think that a structure that has no place in poetry has no place as an example in a metrical treatise, but not so Aldhelm. His four

³² Aldhelm, *Opera*, 84.

³³ Orchard, *Poetic Art*, 128. For Audax’s condemnation of spondaic fifth feet, see *Audacis excerpta de Scauro et Palladio*, ed. Heinrich Keil, GL 7, (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1880; reprinted Hildesheim: Olms, 1961), 320–361, at 338–339.

³⁴ Aldhelm, *Opera*, 83.

³⁵ Lapidge, “Aldhelm’s Latin Poetry,” 213.

³⁶ Aldhelm, *Opera*, 87. Although Ennius might have approved of the structure of these lines, they would have struck even Lucretius as archaic: in a *spondeiazon* of the developed type, the fifth-foot spondee is always preceded by a dactyl (unlike *mundum salvāvit*) and word-division between the fifth and sixth feet is strenuously avoided (unlike *salvat saecula*).

solitary spondaic verses in *De metris* must be viewed as a self-indulgent exercise in the mathematics of the hexameter.³⁷ As such, they illuminate Aldhelm's verse technique, based on the endless permutation of metrical units, very well indeed.

In fact, not only does Aldhelm condemn spondaic fifth feet in his metrical writings, but he goes so far as to pray for protection against them in the invocation at the beginning of his *Carmen de virginitate* (verse 49):³⁸

Spondaeī quintam contemnat sillaba partem

[Let the syllable of the spondee shun the fifth foot].

Aldhelm's verse composition proved to be the single most influential model for subsequent Anglo-Latin hexameter poetry. For many poets, especially those of the so-called Southumbrian school, this meant the wholesale adoption of the three-part structure of the Aldhelmian hexameter. In Anglo-Latin hexameter poetry, the fifth foot is almost invariably a dactyl, and this can probably be largely attributed to Aldhelm's influence.³⁹

6. Bede's views on spondaic fifth feet

In his condemnation of spondaic verses, the Venerable Bede was even more explicit than Aldhelm. In his metrical treatise *De arte metrica*, he echoes the late Latin grammarians in taking a cautious view of all metrical oddities, and in many respects goes even further. His definition of the structure of the hexameter states unequivocally:

Constat autem ex dactylo et spondeo et trochaeo, ita ut recipiat spondem locis omnibus praeter quintum, dactylum praeter ultimum, trochaeum vero loco tantum ultimo.⁴⁰

[It consists of the dactyl, the spondee and the trochee, taking a spondee in any foot except the fifth, a dactyl in any foot excepting the last, and the trochee only in the last.]

³⁷ On Aldhelm's mathematical approach to metre, see Carin Ruff, "The Place of Metrics in Anglo-Saxon Latin Education: Aldhelm and Bede," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* (2005): 149–170, at 154–165.

³⁸ Aldhelm, *Opera*, 355.

³⁹ Orchard, "After Aldhelm," 97, 99.

⁴⁰ Bede, "*De arte metrica et de schematibus et tropis*" (hereafter Bede, *DAM*), ed. Calvin B. Kendall, in *Beda's Venerabilis opera. Opera didascalica*, ed. Charles W. Jones, CCSL 123A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1975), 59–171, at 108–109.

The definition is lifted almost verbatim from Mallius Theodorus,⁴¹ but the words “praeter quintum” (‘excepting the fifth foot’) appear to be Bede’s own contribution. It seems that Bede did not believe that fifth-foot spondees had a place in the dactylic hexameter, and his efforts at explaining those cases in which they do appear are often very convoluted.

One such effort appears in his chapter *De episynalipha vel dieresi* (On fusion and resolution),⁴² where he presents the reader with a complex “parasite-vowel theory” to excuse a number of hexameter lines with a spondaic fifth foot. The lines are taken from the Christian poets Juvenecus, Paulinus of Nola and Prudentius, and are the following:⁴³

Illī continuō statuunt ter dēn(a) argentī⁴⁴

[They immediately agree on thirty pieces of silver];

Et spatīi coepēr(e) et culminis incrēmenta⁴⁵

[They began to grow in both breadth and height];

Sic prope, sic longē sita culmina respergēbat⁴⁶

[So (the storm) sprayed the buildings near and far];

Dixerat haec et laeta Libīdinis interfectae⁴⁷

[She had said this, and, rejoicing in the death of lust];

Palpitat atqu(e) aditū spīrāminis interceptō⁴⁸

[She shudders, and her intake of breath is cut off].

⁴¹ Mallius Theodorus, *De metris*, ed. Heinrich Keil, GL VI, (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1874; reprinted Hildesheim: Olms, 1961), 585–601, at 589.

⁴² Bede, *DAM*, 122–127. Bede’s terminology in this chapter differs from our standard usage: he employs the term *diaeresis* for the resolution of vowels, the antithesis of *synaeresis*, or fusion of vowels, which he, in turn, calls by the name “episynalipha” (= episynaloepha); he does not use *diaeresis* to denote a word-break that occurs between feet.

⁴³ Bede, *DAM*, 124–125.

⁴⁴ Iuvenc. 4.426.

⁴⁵ Paulin. 28.202.

⁴⁶ Paulin. 28.919.

⁴⁷ Prud. psychomach. 98.

⁴⁸ Prud. psychomach. 594.

Bede contends that these lines, despite their appearance, do not really have spondaic fifth feet, but that their final words are to be scanned *arigentī, incerementa, resperigēbat, interefectae* and *intericeptō*, respectively. In other words, he supposes that a transitional vowel (either *i* or *e*) would be inserted into the word, thereby effectively turning the spondaic fifth foot into a dactyl. This would, according to Bede, happen naturally in conjunction with the *r* sound, which would otherwise be “too harsh” next to another consonant. Bede does not appear to mind that in the case of *incrēmenta* the vowel lengths would also have to be tampered with (*incrēmenta* > *incērēmenta*).

Another example of a spondaic verse in a Christian poem appears in Bede’s chapter 15, *Quod et auctoritas saepe et necessitas metricorum decreta violet* (‘How metric rules are sometimes violated either by authority or out of necessity’).⁴⁹ The line is from Caelius Sedulius’s *Carmen Paschale*, a hexameter epic on the Christ’s Passion, and represents Sedulius’s only use of the structure:

Scribitur et titulus: Hic est rēx Iūdaeōrum.⁵⁰

[And the inscription is written: this is the king of the Jews.]

In this case, Bede is willing to concede that the spondaic fifth foot may be genuine, but he still suggests an alternative scansion in which the beginning of *Iūdaeōrum* is scanned as a dactyl (possibly with the initial *i* as a long vowel and *ae* as a short one: *i-u-de-ō-rum*).⁵¹

Quod quomodo scandendum iudicaverit, videat qui potest, utrum “Iūdaeōrum” duos spondeos quinta et sexta regione contra morem, an solutis syllabis, iuxta quod supra monstravimus, dactylum fieri voluerit et spondeum.⁵²

[Let those who can decide for themselves how the author wanted this line to be scanned: whether he wanted *Iūdaeōrum* to be two spondees

⁴⁹ Bede, *DAM*, 127–129.

⁵⁰ Sed. Pasch. carm. 5, 196.

⁵¹ Bede, *Libri II de arte metrica et de schematibus et tropis. The art of Poetry and Rhetoric*, ed. and trans. Calvin B. Kendall, Bibliotheca Germanica, Series Nova vol. 2 (Saarbrücken: AQ-Verlag, 1991), 125.

⁵² Bede, *DAM*, 129.

in the fifth and sixth feet, which is contrary to practice, or whether he wanted it to be a dactyl and a spondee with the syllables resolved in the manner previously demonstrated.]

Bede's explicit intention was to create guidelines for good Christian poetry, which apparently contributed to his sometimes suspicious opinions on pre-Christian authors. He devotes an entire chapter to the metrical transgressions of the pagan authors, giving it the title *Ut prisci poetae quaedam aliter quam moderni posuerunt* ('On the differences between ancient and modern poets'). He classifies the curriculum poets as either "ancient" or "modern", the former being the pre-Christian classics (mainly Vergil), and the latter the late antique Christian poets. In this chapter he explains several metrical liberties taken by the "ancients", including unusual line-endings, hiatuses and the like. The chapter is presumably intended as a caveat to young poets, who otherwise might run the risk of picking up archaic and obsolete poetic techniques, and the quotations Bede uses to illustrate these techniques are traditional text-book examples. The chapter's one example of a spondaic fifth foot is from the *Aeneid* (7, 654), a rather well-circulated quotation also cited by Audax, Aldhelm and Victorinus:

Aut lēvēs ocreās lentō dūcunt argentō

[Or they make smooth greaves out of malleable silver].

Here again Bede brings his "parasite-vowel theory" to the rescue:

Quamvis hoc rarissime inveniatur, nisi ita ordinatum, ut... spondeus qui in quinta regione est R litteram habeat alteri consonanti vel praepositam vel subiectam, cuius duritia per adiectam vocalem levigata, dactylus sentiatur in sono, cum pareat spondeus in scripto.⁵³

[Although this is rarely encountered unless it is arranged so that the spondee in the fifth foot has the letter *r* either preceding or following another consonant and its harshness is softened by the addition of a vowel; thereby we hear the foot scanned as a dactyl, although it appears as a spondee in writing.]

Bede's suggested reading for the final word of the line would presumably be *arigentō*.

In Bede's *De arte metrica*, we witness the spondaic fifth foot finally excised from the repertory of accepted verse techniques. Bede excludes

⁵³ Bede, *DAM*, 130.

it as a possible structure from his definition of the dactylic hexameter, and elsewhere states that it is “contrary to practice”, even going to considerable lengths to prove that what appear to be spondaic fifth feet really are nothing of the sort. Not only does Bede explicitly proscribe fifth-foot spondees, he appears to harbour serious doubts as to whether they had really existed at all.

Bede’s approach to the subject of fifth-foot spondees reflects his hands-on approach to metre. Ever critical of older grammarians, he is not afraid to reformulate metrical rules when his cited examples seem to require it. At times, he tends to be more dogmatic than his predecessors, and his views on fifth-foot spondees are a case in point. In his *De arte metrica*, he has effectively turned what used to be a general tendency into a fixed metrical law. For him, spondaic fifth feet are not merely unaesthetic or outdated, but well-nigh impossible.

Bede’s treatise on metre turned out to be a massive success: it was rapidly disseminated throughout all of Western Europe, and it remained a standard textbook until well into the twelfth century. Bede’s views on metre affected subsequent generations of poets, often even in the cases where his definitions are faulty.⁵⁴ Apparently, his views on fifth-foot spondees were often followed by equal zeal.

Medieval hexameter poetry is generally based on imitation, often of Vergil. Stylistic variation can usually be attributed to the background, education and personal tastes of each individual poet. On the whole, however, the spondaic fifth foot seems to be the one Vergilian device medieval poets were reluctant to adopt. In his analysis of the 2,928 lines of Heiric of Auxerre’s ninth-century *Vita sancti Germani*,⁵⁵ Dag Norberg has found only three spondaic fifth feet, all of which belong to the conservative type in which the line is ended by a quadrisyllabic word, while in the *Vita Aegili*, by Candidus of Fulda,⁵⁶ there are none at all.⁵⁷ There are no spondaic fifth feet in such works as Alcuin’s *Versus de patribus, regibus et sanctis Eboracensis ecclesii*,⁵⁸ or, according to my

⁵⁴ As Norberg points out, Bede’s erroneous definition of the trochaic septenarius as always having a trochaic third foot was slavishly followed at least by Hrabanus Maurus, Walahfrid Strabo, and Hincmar of Reims. See *Introduction*, 77.

⁵⁵ MGH PAC 3, 428–517.

⁵⁶ MGH PAC 2, 94–117.

⁵⁷ Norberg, *Introduction*, 64–65.

⁵⁸ Alcuin, *Versus de patribus, regibus et sanctis Eboracensis ecclesiae*, ed. and trans. Peter Goodman, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), cviii.

observation, in Walahfrid Strabo's *De visionibus Wettini*,⁵⁹ or the verse hagiography *Vita Sancti Galli Confessoris*,⁶⁰ although Strabo uses other unusual metrical structures, such as pentasyllabic and monosyllabic words at the ends of lines, and once, in his *De cultura hortorum*,⁶¹ elides the final vowel of a line; but these, of course, are not irregularities that Bede had explicitly condemned. Strabo's *De cultura hortorum* has a sole fifth-foot spondee in its line 43, a metrical joke in the manner of Venantius Fortunatus, where disagreeable plants are depicted with a disagreeable line-ending:

Sponte renāscendum complexibus urticārum⁶²

[(Having weeded out) the tangles of nettles that grow back on their own].

7. *Final remarks*

The history of the fifth-foot spondee reflects the whole evolution of Latin metrics from Ennius to the Anglo-Saxons. Over the course of nine centuries, Latin poetry went through the complex stages of imitation, experimentation, and ossification, and there were bound to be some casualties. Through trial and error, some metrical structures were found to be more suitable than others, the spondaic fifth foot inevitably falling into the category of "the others". Although several poets delighted in this structure, relishing in its unique weightiness and associations with Greek culture, it had the serious drawback of making the hexameter line less recognisable, and it never quite shed its image of being a metrical quirk. This is reflected by the sometimes paradoxical nature of the objections it excited: it was "too soft" for Quintilian, but "too hard" for Audax and Aldhelm. By the time of the earliest Anglo-Saxon hexameter poets and grammarians, the history and aesthetic function of the spondaic fifth foot had fallen into obscurity, and at a time when classical prosody had become a thing gleaned from books, it was an unaffordable luxury. Aldhelm recognised fifth-foot spondees as a strictly theoretical construction that had no role in actual poetry, a view reflected in the poetry composed by

⁵⁹ MGH PAC 2, 301–333.

⁶⁰ MGH PAC 2, 428–473.

⁶¹ MGH PAC 2, 335–350.

⁶² MGH PAC 2, 336.

the later Anglo-Latin poets who came under his influence. Bede, in his *De arte metrica*, took an even more radical line, ruling out fifth-foot spondees from the very definition of the dactylic hexameter. Bede's treatise turned out to have an even more extensive influence on subsequent poetry than Aldhelm's: it quickly became an authority even in continental Europe, and may effectively have consigned spondaic fifth feet to oblivion.

Works Cited

- Alcuin. 1982. *Versus de patribus, regibus et sanctis Eboracensis ecclesiae*. Ed. and trans. Peter Goodman. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Aldhelm. 1919. *Opera omnia*. Ed. Rudolf Ehwald. Monumenta Germaniae historica. Auctores antiquissimi 15. Berlin: Weidmann.
- . 1985. *The Poetic Works*. Trans. Michael Lapidge and James Rosier. Cambridge: Brewer.
- Audax. 1880. *Audacis Excerpta de Scauro et Palladio*. Ed. Heinrich Keil. GL 7. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner; reprinted 1961 Hildesheim: Olms. 320–361.
- Bede. 1975. *De arte metrica et de schematibus et tropis*. Ed. Calvin B. Kendall. In *Bedae Venerabilis opera. Opera didascalica*, ed. Charles W. Jones, 59–171. Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 123A. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 1991. *Libri II de arte metrica et de schematibus et tropis. The art of Poetry and Rhetoric*. Ed. and trans. Calvin B. Kendall. Bibliotheca Germanica. Series Nova vol. 2. Saarbrücken: AQ-Verlag.
- Cicero, M. Tullius. 1913. *Letters to Atticus II*. Ed. and transl. E. O. Winstedt. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann. Reprinted 1966.
- Courcelle, Pierre. 1969. *Late Latin Writers and Their Greek Sources*, trans. by Harry E. Wedeck. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Drexler, Hans. 1967. *Einführung in die römische Metrik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Duckworth, George Eckel. 1969. *Vergil and Classical Hexameter Poetry: A study in Metrical Variety*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ennius, Quintus. 1985. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Ed. Otto Skutsch. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lapidge, Michael. 1979. Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse. *Comparative Literature* 31: 209–231.
- Mallius Theodorus. 1874. *De metris*. Ed. Heinrich Keil. GL 6. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner; reprinted 1961 Hildesheim: Olms, 585–601.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1923. *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Norberg, Dag. 1958. *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale*. Acta universitatis Stockholmiensis. Studia Latina Stockholmensia 5. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Nougaret, Louis. 1948. *Traité de métrique latine classique*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Orchard, Andy. 1992. After Aldhelm: The Teaching and Transmission of the Anglo-Latin Hexameter. *Journal of Medieval Latin* 2: 1–43.
- . 1994. *The Poetic Art of Aldhelm*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quintilian (Quintilianus, M. Fabius). 1970. *Institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim*, vol. 2. Ed. M. Winterbottom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raven, David S. 1965. *Latin Metre*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Ruff, Carin. 2005. The Place of Metrics in Anglo-Saxon Latin Education: Aldhelm and Bede. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 104: 149–170.
- Sicking, C. M. J. 1993. *Griechische Verslehre*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft: Abt. 2, Teil 4. München: Beck.
- Wilkinson, L. P. 1963. *Golden Latin Artistry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

THE REPRESENTATIONS OF EMOTIONS CONNECTED TO DREAMS AND VISIONS IN PRE-CAROLINGIAN CONTINENTAL AND ANGLO-LATIN NARRATIVES¹

Jesse Keskiaho
University of Helsinki

Introduction

Emotions and dreams, both psychological phenomena according to modern understanding, were already seen as linked in ancient thought. Barbara Rosenwein² has in her recent studies argued that it should be possible to write a history of emotions, or rather, a history of what she calls “emotional communities,” that is, a study of the cultures and discourses of emotion of the communities which provide the original context for our sources. Her work focuses on communities in seventh-century Gaul, and deals with all kinds of emotions. While her analysis in many places emphasises practical and political explanations for the cultures she discusses, one of her general conclusions is that “emotional styles have much to do with modes of religious expression.”³ In my own studies on the history of ideas about dreams and

¹ This article first took form as a more general survey on the topic, delivered as “Emotions and Dreams in the Early Middle Ages: Theories and Representations” at the International Medieval Congress in Leeds in 2006. I wish to thank my colleagues in Rome and in Helsinki, especially Alaric Hall, for helpful comments and critique on the different versions of this article. I naturally retain sole responsibility for any omissions and failings.

² Most recently, Barbara Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006). The main theme of the 2006 Leeds International Medieval Congress, “Emotion and Gesture,” reflects the resurgence of interest in the history of emotions. See the debate in *Early Medieval Europe* 10:2 (2001).

³ Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 202. The secular emphasis is even more clear in the articles preceding this monograph; see, e.g., Barbara Rosenwein, “Writing and Emotions in Gregory of Tours,” in *Vom Nutzen des Schreibens. Soziales Gedächtnis, Herrschaft und Besitz im Mittelalter*, ed. Walter Pohl and Paul Herold, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 206 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2002), 23–32; Barbara Rosenwein, “Pouvoir et passion. Communautés émotionnelles en France au VII^e siècle,” *Annales-Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 58 (2003): 1271–1292.

visions, I have examined the problematic relationship between the influence of patristic theological ideas and that of literary conventions on early medieval (hagiographical) narratives, and the ways in which the intended nature and use of the individual texts may have affected the balance of these influences.⁴ Here, I pick up on the recent interest in the history of emotions, alongside the wider importance of the relationship between ideology and literary models in early medieval texts, to investigate the ideas and models pertaining to the significance of emotions in oneiric experiences, and their incidence in early medieval hagiography. This case study examines in a specific context aspects of Rosenwein's general conclusion on the connections between "modes of religious expression" and emotionality in texts.

I begin by reviewing the philosophical and theological ideas of Antiquity about the role of emotions in dreams and visions. I then discuss two distinct ideas of—or models for—the significance of fear in visionary phenomena, mainly on the basis of Merovingian texts, before discussing these models and related problems of interpretation in pre-Carolingian Anglo-Latin narratives.⁵ I find it fitting to offer this

⁴ I have found that the Anglo-Latin texts of the early eighth century, in spite of their small number, exhibit more instances of the influence of theological ideas about the dangers of dreaming than the more voluminous contemporary Continental material, something I have tentatively attributed to the smaller and more learned (at least in Pope Gregory's writings) immediate audiences of these texts; see Jesse Keskiahho, "The Handling and Interpretation of Dreams and Visions in Late Sixth- to Eighth-Century Gallic and Anglo-Latin Hagiography and Histories," *Early Medieval Europe* 13 (2005): 246–247, and Jesse Keskiahho, "Eighth-Century Anglo-Latin Ecclesiastical Attitudes to Dreams and Visions," *Ennen ja nyt* 4:4 (2004), <<http://www.ennenjanyt.net/4-04/referee/keskiahho.pdf>>, passim. On Gregory's influence on dream-stories in Anglo-Latin hagiography, without comparison with Continental narratives, see Malcolm R. Godden, "Were It Not that I Have Bad Dreams: Gregory the Great and the Anglo-Saxons on the Dangers of Dreaming," in *Rome and the North. The Early Reception of Gregory the Great in Germanic Europe*, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer Jr., Kees Dekker, and David F. Johnson, *Medievalia Groningana* 4 (Paris: Peeters, 2001), 93–113, at 110. I wish to thank Rob Meens for pointing me to this article, of which I was unaware when writing the studies referred to above.

⁵ As I compare the Anglo-Latin materials with Continental Latin texts, I shall not here examine Old English texts, such as *The Dream of the Rood*. Note that the present paper speaks interchangeably of visions and dreams (or oneiric experiences), reflecting the ambiguity prevalent not only in medieval usage but also in late antique theory—Macrobius, for example, discusses waking visions alongside meaningful dreams. See, e.g., John S. Hanson, "Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 2.23.2, ed. Wolfgang Haase (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980), 1395–1427, at 1408; Jean-Claude Schmitt, *Les revenants. Les vivants et les morts dans la société médiévale* (sine loco: Gallimard, 1994), 252; Guy G. Stroumsa, "Dreams

paper for this collection, as Matti Kilpiö always understood English philology in the widest sense, and encouraged me to conduct comparisons of Anglo-Latin and Continental sources.

It has been argued that early medieval dream narratives owe little to classical oneirocritical theory.⁶ The role of emotions was not generally at the forefront of Western thought, even in the case of ascetic concerns over dreams, but those ideas that did connect true visions with particular emotions appear to have been, in some branches of the ascetic tradition, almost opposite to those adopted by Christians at large, and especially to those adopted by the rising relic cults. Although hagiography generally followed a long-established and apparently pre-Christian model, in which genuine and convincing dreams and visions were associated with the instilling of fear in the visionary, some ascetic texts seem to present the opposite notion, linking true visions with a calming effect. While I illustrate this contrast with a selection of texts mainly from Merovingian Gaul, I also examine the Anglo-Latin

and Visions in Early Christian Discourse,” in *Dream Cultures: Explorations in the Comparative History of Dreaming*, ed. David Schulman and Guy G. Stroumsa, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 189–212, at 189. It should be noted that, while my review of portrayals of dreams in these texts approaches comprehensiveness, I have studied the portrayals of emotions mainly in connection with dream stories rather than in any other context. Even more than emotions, dreams only have objective reality as stories. I am here interested in these stories in their own contexts and with their specific purposes. See Keskiaho, “The Handling and Interpretation,” esp. 229–230, and also Rosenwein’s somewhat related discussion of her method, *Emotional Communities*, 26–29. On hagiographies as pragmatic texts with individual aims, see primarily Hedwig Röckelein, “Zur Pragmatik hagiographischer Schriften im Frühmittelalter,” in *Bene vivere in communitate. Beiträge zum italienischen und deutschen Mittelalter. Hagen Keller zum 60. Geburtstag überreicht von seinen Schülerinnen und Schülern*, ed. Thomas Scharff and Thomas Behrmann (Münster: Waxmann, 1997), 225–238; Wolfert van Egmond, “The Audience of Early Medieval Hagiographical Texts: Some Questions Revisited,” in *New Approaches to Medieval Communication*, ed. Marco Mostert (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), 41–68. Whereas many of the Merovingian narratives were written with a wide audience in mind, the Anglo-Latin texts had by necessity a limited primary audience (although their contents would have been intended for transmission to wider audiences). On Anglo-Saxon saints’ cults in general, see David Rollason, *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 83–104, but cf. Catherine Cubitt, “Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints,” *Early Medieval Europe* 9 (2000): 53–83.

⁶ See Alison M. Peden, “Macrobius and Medieval Dream Literature,” *Medium Aevum* 54 (1985): 59–73, at 63, and cf. Jacques Le Goff, “Le christianisme et les rêves II^e–VII^e siècle,” in *Un autre Moyen Âge* (sine loco: Gallimard, 1999); originally in *I sogni nel medioevo. Seminario internazionale Roma, 2–4 ottobre 1983*, ed. Tullio Gregory (Roma: Edizioni dell’Ateneo, 1985), 689–737, at 727. Note, however, that in antiquity, too, narratives were somewhat separate from theoretical concerns; see, e.g., Hanson, “Dreams and Visions.”

material to illustrate some of the complexities in the interplay between theories and models, as well as the secondariness of these concerns. We shall see both a case of comprehensive adoption of the ascetic model, and one showing the relative absence of the cultic paradigm. I suggest that this variation reflects the differing religious concerns of our texts (relic cult or monastic environment; hagiography of a specific individual or other text type). This seems to confirm the idea that the portrayal of the emotions connected with oneiric phenomena is indeed closely tied to each text's central mode of religious expression, which in turn would have implications for the representativeness of dreams with regard to the emotional ideals evidenced by these texts.

Dreams and Emotions in Classical and Patristic Thought

Early medieval cultures inherited several partly overlapping notions concerning the meanings of emotions in connection with dreams and visions. These cannot be synthesised and presented as a coherent body of classical "thought" on the matter, connected as they are to different intellectual contexts and representing at times complementary or competing interpretations.⁷ Indeed, early medieval ideas about dreams are similarly diverse.⁸ In this section, I explore a selection of these views as a background to my discussion on emotions and dreams in hagiography, presenting the roots of both the ascetic ideas, which favour peaceful true visions, and the "cultic model," which connects religious visions with fear. We shall see that neither idea was central in patristic theology, although both were transmitted using literary models.

The Graeco-Roman medical tradition considered dreams to be among the symptoms of the body's humoral balance; for example, dis-

⁷ This is true also for classical views and theories on dreams in general. See specifically William V. Harris, "Roman Opinions about the Truthfulness of Dreams," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 93 (2003): 18–34, and, more generally, Beat Näf, *Traum und Traumdeutung im Altertum* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004).

⁸ Isabel Moreira, "Dreams and Divination in Early Medieval Canonical and Narrative Sources: The Question of Clerical Control," *The Catholic Historical Review* 89 (2003): 621–42, at 623, argued that there was no "Christian culture of dreaming" imposed by the clergy upon the laity in the early Middle Ages. However, her study considers only the Merovingian period. In Keskiaho, "The Handling and Interpretation," 229, I appear regrettably to have referred to the phrase mistakenly as "Christian theory of dreams". However, my observation remains that there were ideas about how Christians *should* approach dreams, even if diverse and variably implemented.

turbed or disturbing dreams were thought to be a manifestation of the passions produced by humoral misalignment.⁹ On the other hand, the oneirocritical tradition was interested in emotions in dreams mainly as a means to better distinguish divinatory dreams from “empty” ones; this was achieved by recognising in the latter the everyday concerns of the dreamer worthlessly circulating in his mind, creating restlessness and anxiety.¹⁰ Philosophical thought, mainly belonging to the Middle- and Neoplatonic schools, explained true or divinatory dreams as a manifestation of the mantic powers of the soul, liberated from its passionate part during sleep.¹¹

While philosophical traditions tended to devalue the importance of disturbed or frightening dreams, the Mediterranean religions favoured strong emotions, especially fear, in connection with experiencing the divine.¹² This difference is mainly due to thinking of visionary experience more in terms of external and divine (rather than internal and human) influence. Emotions described in connection with biblical dreams and visions are likewise mostly related to fear. In the Old Testament, however, fear always comes after a dream, in response to the holiness of the experience (Gen. 28:10–17, Num. 22:31, Judges

⁹ Steven M. Oberhelman, “The Diagnostic Dream in Ancient Medical Theory and Practice,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 61 (1987): 48–53; Steven M. Oberhelman, “Dreams in Graeco-Roman Medicine,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 2.37.1, ed. Wolfgang Haase (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993), 127–136. See also Steven M. Oberhelman, “Galen, *On Diagnosis from Dreams*,” *Journal of the History of Medicine* 38 (1983): 36–47.

¹⁰ See J. H. Waszink, “Die sogenannte Fünfteilung der Träume bei Chalcidius und ihre Quellen,” *Mnemosyne* 3rd series 9 (1941): 65–85; A. H. M. Kessels, “Ancient Systems of Dream-Classification,” *Mnemosyne* 3rd series 22 (1969): 389–424; C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1968), 178–180; and Ambrosius Theodorus Macrobius, *Commentarii in somnium Scipionis*, ed. Jacob Willis (Leipzig: Teubner, 1963), 9–10.

¹¹ See Waszink, “Die sogenannte Fünfteilung,” 67–68; Kessels, “Ancient Systems,” 399–402; Martine Dulaey, *Le rêve dans la vie et la pensée de saint Augustin*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 50 (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1973), 22–24 and 90–91; Jacqueline Amat, *Songes et visions. L’au-delà dans la littérature latine tardive*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 109 (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1985), 26–61.

¹² See, e.g., Hanson, “Dreams and Visions,” 1412. Both pagan and, later, Christian literature mentioned nocturnal chastisements and retributive terrors; see the references collected by Paul Antin, “Autour du songe de S. Jérôme,” in Paul Antin, *Recueil sur saint Jérôme* (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1968), 71–100, at 76–80; a revised version of an article originally published in *Revue des Études latines* 41 (1963): 350–377. Additionally, see Amat, *Songes et visions*, 287 and n. 145.

6:22–23), while it seems that only the dreams of pagans (e.g., Dan. 2 and esp. 4:2) or chastising nightmares (Job 4:12–21, 7:13–14, Liber sapientiae 18:17–19; Sirach 40:5–7) are terrifying in themselves. In the New Testament, Matthew includes no descriptions of emotions beyond the mysterious oneiric troubles endured by the wife of Pilate (Matt. 27:29), while Luke, apparently in keeping with literary convention, almost invariably describes initial fear during the experience—“turbatio” (‘confusion’) or “timor” (‘fear’)—followed by a “noli timere” (‘fear not’) from the apparition (Luke 1:11–20, 1:28–38, 2:8–15). In Acts, Saul is shaken on the road to Damascus (9:3–9), and Cornelius is frightened by his encounter with an angel (10:3–7).

Later Christian thinkers and writers considered emotions, whose importance to moral discipline they had learned from philosophical traditions, in a variety of contexts, including that of dreaming.¹³ Many of the early theologians seem to have adopted ideas similar to those of the philosophical traditions in which they were versed. Tertullian (ca. 155–230) divided dreams theoretically into agitated and empty or honest and holy.¹⁴ Lactantius (ca. 240–320) defended the Judaeo-Christian prophets, asserting that they prophesied calmly, not in an agitated frenzy.¹⁵ However, in an interesting contrast to this line of thought, St Ambrose (337/40–397), as a brief exegesis on the prophecy of Abraham (Gen. 15:12), makes reference to the visitation to Mary (Luke 1:30, 31), as well as Saul’s vision (Acts 9:14), and concludes that prophetic ecstasy and encounters with the divine necessarily produce fear.¹⁶

¹³ See generally Simo Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 111–176; and Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 39–53.

¹⁴ See Kessels, “Ancient Systems,” 399–401. However, honesty obviously took precedence over lack of agitation: Tertullian narrates a number of oneiric chastisements, according to Amat, *Songes et visions*, 97–104, cf. Dulaey, *Le rêve*, 56.

¹⁵ See Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones*, ed. Samuel Brandt, L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 19:1 (Prague: Academia Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, 1890), 1.4.3–4, 12. I am grateful to Outi Kaltio for this reference.

¹⁶ Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *De Abraham*, ed. Carolus Schenkl, Sancti Ambrosii Opera 1:1, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 32:1 (Prague: Academia litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, 1897), 613–614: “Denique quam hoc Abraham spiritali et prophetico affectu fecerit sequentia docent. nam solis occasu excessus cecidit supra <Abraham>: et ecce timor magnus tenebrosus incubuit super illum [Gen. 15:12]. excessus prophetis fieri solet, sicut habes prophetam dixisse: ego dixi in excessu meo: omnis homo mendax [Ps. 115:2]. excedit enim mens prophetae uelut fines quosdam

From Origen (ca. 185–254) onwards, however, ascetic thought in particular began to develop principles for distinguishing spirits that had obvious connections to the medical and philosophical theories of emotions.¹⁷ Evagrius Ponticus (345–399) considered the monitoring of dreams to be part of the ascetic discipline.¹⁸ He considered both dreams and emotions to be manifestations or actualisations of the pre-passions, thoughts (*logismoi*) introduced into the mind by sensory perception or spiritual means. Dreams thus indicated the dreamer's progress towards freedom from mental images, freedom from passions, and so to purity of mind. The dreamer's emotions and gestures indicated to his spiritual father whether he had consented to the oneiric provocations. Although Evagrius was suspicious of all visual imagination, the passions at issue were mainly sexual. It is in this limited sense that John Cassian (ca. 360–433) introduced the idea in

humanae prudentiae, quando repletur deo, et ante euacuat se cogitationibus et disceptationibus saeculi huius, ut aduenienti gratiae spiritali puram se et exinanitam praebeat, superueniat in eam spiritus sanctus magna se ui infundens, ita ut mens hominis subito turbetur. denique Angelus uenit ad Mariam-et cum sedulitate et gratia uenerat: et tamen Maria mota est in introitu eius. unde ait angelus ait ad eam: *ne timeas, Maria; inuenisti enim gratiam apud deum. et ecce concipies in utero et paries filium* [Luke 1:30, 31]. cognoscimus ergo quia quando uenit gratia dei super propheticam mentem, subito inruit et inde incubuisse et decidisse super prophetam spiritum sanctum legimus, quia excessum patitur et turbatur et timet et quibusdam ignorantiae et imprudentiae tenebris offunditur, sicut et in Actibus Apostolorum legimus quia circumfulsit super Saulum <lux> de caelo, et cecidit et horrore animi turbatus est et audiuit uocem de caelo dicentem: *Saule, Saule, quid me persequeris?* [Acts 9:4] desinit enim uidere saecularia qui incipit audire diuina. unde et timorem Abrahae et tenebras mirari non debes, quasi praeter uirtutem aut meritum eius acciderint, cum prophetarum consuetudini congruere aduertat quando adiuncta, ut cognoscant futura." On Ambrose, see further Amat, *Songes et visions*, 212–215.

¹⁷ See generally Günter Switek, "Discretio spirituum." Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Spiritualität," *Theologie und Philosophie* 47 (1972): 36–76, at 41–44, and Joseph T. Lienhard, "On 'Discernment of Spirits' in the Early Church," *Theological Studies* 41 (1980): 505–529. Cf. Fr. Dingjan, *Discretio. Les origines patristiques et monastiques de la doctrine sur la prudence chez saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1967), 235–251.

¹⁸ For what follows on Evagrius's thought, see F. Refoulé, "Rêves et vie spirituelle d'après Évagre le Pontique," *La Vie Spirituelle* supplément 59 (1961): 485–503; Switek, "Discretio spirituum," 48–50; Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), 67–84; David Brakke, "The Problematicization of Nocturnal Emissions in Early Christian Syria, Egypt, and Gaul," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3 (1995): 419–460, at 438–440; Columba Stewart, "Imageless Prayer and the Theological Vision of Evagrius Ponticus," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9 (2001): 186–191. Generally on Evagrius and the control of emotions, see Knuuttila, *Emotions*, 141–144. Cf. Stroumsa, "Dreams and Visions," 200–203.

Latin.¹⁹ Cassian picked up Evagrius's idea of dreams as indications of lingering passions, but used it only in the discussion of sexual dreams, which he portrayed as the final obstacle to be conquered by otherwise chaste ascetics.²⁰ However, impure dreams could arise not only from sexual passions, but from all kinds of inappropriate feelings, such as pride.²¹ On the other hand, the *Vita Sancti Antonii*, by Athanasius of Alexandria (ca. 293–373), promoted a division of dreams into good, calm, passionless dreams and disturbing demonic ones, making this distinction a central principle in the discernment of spirits (*diakrisis pneumaton/discretio spirituum*). Athanasius's Anthony taught that holy spirits—angels—do not cause disturbance or agitation, but are lovable and peaceful, creating trust and calm in the beholder. Demons, on the other hand, disrupt meditation and bring confusion of thought, sadness, longing for the world, and above all fear. Anthony concedes that there are those that, as an acknowledgement of their inferior status, also fear the saints. However, good spirits will quickly dissipate such fear, replacing it with joy, whereas evil spirits double the fear and create disturbance. However, evil spirits are not to be feared, since fear is what gives them their power.²² This scheme fused philosophical

¹⁹ Cassian introduced his Latin readers to Eastern ascetic thought, especially that of Evagrius; however, he subtly altered these ideas to fit his own vision of ascetic and monastic living, not to mention the effect translation had on the philosophical context of Evagrius's ideas; see Owen Chadwick, *John Cassian*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 92–93.

²⁰ Johannes Cassianus, *Collationes XXVIII*, ed. Michael Petschenig, 2nd ed., Gottfried Kreuz, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 13 (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), 12.7.4–5, 346. See also Näf, *Traum und Traumdeutung*, 154.

²¹ Johannes Cassianus, *Collationes*, 22.3, 616–619. Cassianus thought it was possible to rid oneself of nocturnal emissions; see Brakke, “The Problematicization,” 446–458. Aline Rousselle has argued that he designed the monastic diet in order to achieve such a goal, which implies a knowledge of medical theories on the connections between bodily fluids, passions and dreams; see Aline Rousselle, “Abstinence et continence dans le monastères du Gaule méridionale à la fin de l'antiquité et au début du moyen âge. Etude d'un régime alimentaire et de sa fonction,” in *Hommage à André Dupont (1987–1972). Études médiévales languedociennes offertes en hommage par ses anciens collègues, élèves et amis* (Montpellier: Fédération historique du Languedoc méditerranéen et du Roussillon, 1974), 239–254, at 246–249.

²² Athanasie d'Alexandrie, *Vie d'Antoine*, ed. G. J. M. Bartelink, Sources Chrétiennes 400, (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994), 230–234. For the anonymous Latin version see *Vita di Antonio*, ed. G. J. M. Bartelink, trans. Pietro Citati and Salvatore Lilla, introduction Christine Mohrmann (sine loco: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla/Arnaldo Mondadori Editore, 1974), 76–78, and for Evagrius's translation, *Vita Beati Antonii abbatis... interprete Evagrio presbytero Antiocheno*, ed. Rosweyde, Patrologia Latina

traditions with the literary model of *noli timere*, and suggested this model as a categorical rule. Translated into Latin, Athanasius's text relatively quickly became a central literary model, especially for ascetical hagiography in the West.

However—and significantly for the Western Middle Ages—St. Augustine of Hippo (354–430) stands somewhat apart from the tradition of eremitical-ascetical thought that equated disturbing dreams with evil and tranquil ones with good, as well as from the ideas of his teacher Ambrose on prophecy and terror. In *De civitate Dei* he cites an instance of the stereotypical coercive dream in Livy as an example of the subjugation of the pagans by their demonic gods,²³ while in his *Confessiones* he implies that his mother considered disturbed or simply confused dreams empty.²⁴ In *De Genesi ad litteram*, he does observe that, generally, disturbed dreams are bad and calm ones good. It is possible that Augustine was here thinking of the discernment of good and evil spirits as explained by Athanasius's St. Anthony.²⁵ However, Augustine's point was that, while demonic possessions are often disturbed and agitated, and thus easy to recognise, demons can also act with feigned calm.²⁶ This manifestation of the Devil as an angel of light, as mentioned by St. Paul (2 Cor. 11:14), undermines and reveals as simplistic the idea that good spirits can be distinguished from bad based on emotions. Rather than any set criteria, effective discernment called for the *charisma* of discernment of spirits. Furthermore, Augustine seems to have acknowledged the didactic value of frightening visions, citing in a sermon the story of one Tutulismeni, who said he had been flogged in a dream because he had committed perjury.²⁷

73 (Paris: Fratres Garnier, 1879), 142–143. See also Switek, “‘Discretio spirituum,’” 44–48, Lienhard, “On ‘Discernment of Spirits,’” 514–517.

²³ Augustinus, *De civitate Dei libri I–X & XI–XII*, ed. Bernard Dombart and Alfons Kalb, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 47–48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), 4.24, 120, and 22.8.3, 819.

²⁴ Augustinus, *Confessionum libri XII*, ed. Lucas Verheijen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 27 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981), 89. See also Dulaey, *Le rêve*, 70–73.

²⁵ Martine Dulaey (*Le rêve*, 90) saw in this the influence of Neoplatonic thought, but the ascetic theory of discernment is itself built on these traditions. Augustine certainly knew of Athanasius's text; see *Confessionum libri XII*, 8.6, 122.

²⁶ Augustinus, *De Genesi ad litteram*, ed. J. Zycha, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 28 (Prague: Academia litterarum Caesariae Vindobonensis, 1894), 12.13, 398.

²⁷ Augustinus, *Sermones*, Patrologia Latina 38 (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1865), 1109. Cf. Dulaey, *Le rêve*, 132–135, arguing that Augustine considered disturbing and frightful

Like Augustine, Gregory the Great (ca. 540–604) appears to have ultimately disregarded the emotional criteria for distinguishing good spirits from evil,²⁸ and instead emphasised the varied origins of dreams and visions, which necessitated utmost caution and judgement in interpretation. However, he did follow ancient medical opinion in ascribing a role in the production of (empty) dreams to the stomach.²⁹ Gregory also acknowledged the possibility of dreams arising from “cogitatio” (‘thought’) in conjunction with either illusion or revelation. As an example of the latter, he refers to the book of Daniel, where Nebuchadnezzar’s dream occurred as the king lay in his bed, wondering about the future. Such thoughts (*cogitationes*) are clearly connected to hopes and fears, and recall the Stoic pre-passions. This theory allows the influence of good, pious thoughts and emotions on significant dreams.³⁰

In this short review we have seen various types of ideas about the role of emotions in true oneiric phenomena. While passions and empty

dreams mostly the work of the Devil, and did not believe God sent retributive nightmares.

²⁸ Pace R. D. Sorrell, “Dreams and Divination in Certain Writings of Gregory the Great” (B.Litt. Thesis, Oxford University, 1978), 109–110, who states that Gregory shared such ascetic ideals. However, he argues this mainly by pointing to very general parallels between Anthony’s and Gregory’s ideas about discretion, and to Gregory’s (relative, as we shall see) silence about negative emotions in oneiric experiences. While it is clear that Gregory shared ascetic ideas about demons and undesirable emotions (see also Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 81–83), he did not, unlike Anthony, offer this as advice on handling dreams.

²⁹ Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, vol. 3, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, Sources Chrétiennes 265 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1980), 4.50.1–4, 172–174. This seems to have a connection to the medical view of dreams espoused by Cassian (see Rousselle, “Abstinence et continence,” 246–249) that linked (excessive) ingestion and the production of dreams, especially erotic ones. However, the stomach’s state was also used by Macrobius as an illustration of how quotidian concerns produced empty dreams; see Macrobius, *Commentarii*, 1.3.4–5, 9: “Quotiens cura oppressi animi corporisve sive fortunae, qualis vigilantem fatigaverat, talem se ingerit dormienti... si temeto ingurgitatus aut distentus cibo vel abundantia praefocari se aestimet vel gravantibus exonerari, aut contra si esuriens cibum aut potum sitiens desiderare, quaerere, vel etiam invenisse videatur... hinc et insomnio nomen est... quia in ipso somnio tantum modo esse creditur dum videtur, post somnium nullam sui utilitatem vel significationem relinquit.” This might also be based on medical thought; see Kessels, “Ancient Systems,” 414–415. Gregory’s debt to Cassian is apparent: cf. Johannes Cassianus, *Collationes*, 1.19, 27–29, 5.4.6, 123–124 and 12.7.4–5, 346, with Gregorius Magnus, *Moralia in Iob*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 143 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979), 8.24.42, 413–414. Similarly, see Sorrell, “Dreams and Divination,” 36–37.

³⁰ This connection is more explicit in the *Moralia* (c. 8.24.41, 412–413), where he ponders at length on nocturnal terrors, which, he says, can often be the work of God for our rectification, but also the effect of our fear of judgement.

dreams remained connected, the emotionality of dreams and visions did not necessarily invalidate them. The model which I have termed “cultic,” and which was implicit first and foremost in the Bible, associated fear with true visions.³¹ Related to this is the pervasively important fear of God, although this was variably interpreted.³² However, while Anthony’s advice to trust visions that bring peace appears to have failed to convince the most prominent Western theologians, it was widely disseminated in influential translations. Although both Augustine and Gregory recommended only spiritual discretion in very abstract terms in their advice on dreams and visions, emotions, like some other methods of authentication already current in late antiquity,³³ retained occasional importance in these contexts. Their lack of centrality may reflect patristic indifference to them.

The Antonian Model

As the preceding discussion has outlined, in terms of emotional responses, there seem to be two main patterns of visionary experience, the first of which it seems apt to term the Antonian model, as it is most clearly expressed by Athanasius’s St. Anthony, and the second of which I have termed the cultic model. The ideas of the eremitical, Antonian model³⁴ included the distinction between good and tranquil

³¹ On the influence of biblical models on early medieval hagiography in general, see Marc van Uytanghe, *Stylisation biblique et condition humaine dans l’hagiographie mérovingienne*, *Verhandlungen van de Koninklijke academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, klasse del letteren*, jaargang 49, no. 120 (Brussels: AWLSK, 1987).

³² On Gregory, see, e.g., Carole Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 167–168. On a related issue, Alan E. Bernstein, “Tristitia and the Fear of Hell in Monastic Reflection from John Cassian to Hildemar of Corbie,” in *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late Medieval and Reformation History, Essays Presented to Heiko A. Oberman on his 70th Birthday*, ed. Robert J. Bast and Andrew G. Gow (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 183–205. Cf. Francis F. Seeburger, “Humility, Maturity, and the Fear of God: Reflections on RB 7,” *American Benedictine Review* 46 (1995): 149–168.

³³ On methods of authentication, see Keskiäho, “The Handling and Interpretation” and Van Egmond, “Saintly Images.”

³⁴ While influential, the Antonian model does not seem quite representative of “eremitical” thought on these matters. The other major (Latin) texts of ascetic spirituality besides the translations of the *Life of St. Anthony* and John Cassian—the early translations of the lives and sayings of the desert fathers—do not transmit these ideas: see Rufinus Aquileiensis, *Historia monachorum*, *Patrologia Latina* 21 (Paris: Fratres Garnier, 1878), where most visions cause no emotion (392A–393B, 406C, 415A–C,

visions on the one hand and agitating or terrifying and bad ones on the other, and sometimes also the definition of the dreamer's stature according to his or her emotional response to a vision. How far such ideas were received as such and how far they were simply perpetuated through literary models is an interesting question, and many cases are far from clear cut.³⁵ In this chapter I shall review a selection of texts and consider their relation to these ideals, which, as we shall see, were rarely adopted completely.

Clare Stancliffe has argued that in the *Vita S. Martini* by Sulpicius Severus (ca. 363–ca. 420 × 25), the saint's "hebetatio" ('dulling, diminishing') when Satan appears to him disguised as Christ connects the *Vita* to the Antonian tradition of the *diakrisis pneumatōn*, as this term is used to describe one of the emotional responses to demonic apparitions listed in Evagrius's Latin translation of the *Vita S. Antonii*.³⁶

422–423, 0429D, 434A–B). There is one juxtaposition (421C–422A) of people frightened by a dragon with the unemotional *senex* who banishes it. However, at 412A, an angel frightens jailors, and at 425D–426A, a brother negligently falls asleep and is frightened awake by a vision. There are, however, a number of ideas about the connection between wandering and improper thoughts and demons (404A–C, 412C, 442–443, 454–455), as well as that between the excessive intake of food, and especially of water and demons (449B, 458D). In the *Sayings of the Fathers*, true visions can cause sadness and stupefaction; see Pelagius and Johannes, *Verba seniorum*, ed. Rosweyde, *Patrologia Latina* 73 (Paris: Fratres Garnier, 1879), 862C–D, 866B–D. For the most part, they cause no emotions (911C–D, 980C–D, 981A–B), while one true, otherwise peaceful vision leaves the visionary "tremefactus" (903D), and one terrifying vision terrifies (997A–998A). The suggested or implied criteria for discernment do not include emotions. The text portrays (912C) St. Anthony confirming the suspicion of two brothers that (although they were apparently in some sense veridical) they have had demonic fantasies, and implies (981A) that a vision that repeats or persists after three prayers is a true one. Emphasis varies: Martin of Braga translates a host of sayings on *cogitationes*; see Martinus Bracaraensis, *Sententiae Patrum Aegyptiorum*, ed. Claude W. Barlow, *Martini episcopi Bracaraensis opera omnia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950) 31, 37, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44. On these texts, see Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter I: Von der Passio Perpetuae zu den Dialogi Gregors des Großen*, *Quellen und Forschungen zur lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters* 8 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1986), 133, 189–190.

³⁵ See Barbara Rosenwein, "Writing without Fear about Early Medieval Emotions," *Early Medieval Europe* 10 (2001): 229–34, in 231–232, and Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 195–196.

³⁶ Clare Stancliffe, *St. Martin and His Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 237–238, on Sulpicius Severus, *Vie de Saint Martin*, vol. 1, ed. Jacques Fontaine, *Sources Chrétiennes* 133 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1967), c. 24, 306–308. Cf. *Vita Beati Antonii abbatis*, 143A–B: "Pessimorum vero vultus truces, sonitus horridi, sordidi cogitatus, plausus motusque indiscipline adolescentum vel latronum; e quibus confestim timor animae, sensibus torpor incutitur; odium Christianorum, monachorum moeror et taedium, suorum recordatio, metus mortis, cupido nequitiae, lassitudo virtutis, cordis hebetatio."

Elsewhere, Sulpicius provides an example of the role of good, pious emotions in dreams. He describes himself falling into light sleep, his mind filled with *cogitationes*: hope for the future, care for present affairs, fear of judgement, and fear of punishments and sadness for his past sins. Suddenly, a softly laughing Martin appears to inform Sulpicius of his death and ascension.³⁷ This may be contrary to classical oneirocritical thinking,³⁸ but not necessarily to Christian ideas, which generally concentrated on the elimination of undesirable emotions, not of emotions themselves. Moreover, although the dispelled emotions are here neither demonic nor negative in terms of Christian morality, Sulpicius's narrative seems to conform to the ideal of a comforting true vision. However, other examples of this pattern are few and far between. The early sixth-century *Vita patrum Iurensium* seems to follow this tradition, as the most emotional experience it describes, in terms of content if not the saintly visionary's comportment, is the series of temptations of St. Romanus. Here, the saint even scolds the Devil for his variance, thus underlining his own "constantia" ('constancy').³⁹ True visions are accompanied by joy and peace, although they may cause astonishment in their saintly recipients.⁴⁰ The only exception to this is the vision of vocation St. Eugendius received when only an *infans*, which he, "visionis terrore percussus" ('struck down by the terror of the vision'), narrated to his father.⁴¹ This looks like deferential fear, and might be connected to the fact that the visionary is a child, but it is not dismissed by the apparition, as one would expect in the Antonian model.

Such ideals are not brought to the fore in Gregory the Great's *Dialogi*, to which I shall return in more detail later. However, in one story at least, the absence of deferential fear in the presence of the divine suggests special merit. One night, Galla, a holy widow in a convent adjacent to St. Peter's in Rome, saw the titular saint standing at the foot of her bed, and, Gregory points out, "was not thoroughly frightened, but

³⁷ Sulpicius Severus, *Vie de Saint Martin*, ep. 2.1–6, 324–326.

³⁸ E.g., Peden, "Macrobius," 63. Cf., however, Hanson, "Dreams and Visions," 1407, on classical narratives.

³⁹ *Vie des pères du Jura*, ed. F. Martine, Sources Chrétiennes 142, (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968), cc. 54–56, 298–300.

⁴⁰ *Vie des pères du Jura*, c. 105, 350; cc. 135–137, 384–386; c. 153, 402.

⁴¹ *Vie des pères du Jura*, cc. 121–124, 368–372.

exulted, assuming, out of love, a bold attitude.”⁴² Such a connection is not emphasised in the other stories in the *Dialogi*, which were written for an immediate audience of spiritual elite, to be adapted for wider audiences, and were not purely ascetical (let alone eremitical) in tone.⁴³ However, the monastic cultures idealised by Jonas of Bobbio in the middle of the seventh century apparently considered visions to be connected to personal merit. When, in the *Vita S. Iohannis Reomaensis*, a lowly “senex” (‘old man’) enters a church and, with “audaci animo” (‘bold spirit’), beholds the saints John and Silvester, he is upbraided for such presumptuous courage, but forgiven because of his simple heart.⁴⁴ This suggests that a fearless encounter with the saints was not for the infirm in spirit, while the evidence implies a corresponding ideal of peaceful or even joyful true visions.⁴⁵

The connection of visions with merit made humility an important ideal.⁴⁶ In the *Vita S. Columbani discipulorumque eius*, Jonas relates

⁴² Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, 4.14.4, 58: “Nec perterrita timuit, sed ex amore sumens audaciam exultavit” (all translations by the author, unless otherwise indicated). Naturally, this impression is reinforced if one permits conclusions based on the negative evidence of most of the visions narrated by Gregory without descriptions of emotions, cf. Sorrell, *Dreams and Divination*, 109.

⁴³ Gregory wrote his *Dialogues* primarily for his monastic community, although clearly his intention is to provide materials to be transmitted on to wider audiences. See, e.g., Sofia Boesch Gajano, “Dislivelli culturali e mediazioni ecclesiastiche nei *Dialogi* di Gregorio Magno,” *Quaderni Storici* n. 41 a. 14 (1979): 398–415, at 407–408 (now Sofia Boesch Gajano, *Gregorio magno. Alle origini del Medioevo* (Roma: Viella, 2004), 262–264). Certainly, Gregory’s outlook can be characterised as ascetic; see the fine exploration of the emotions in Gregory’s community by Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 79–99.

⁴⁴ Jonas, *Vita Iohannis abbatis Reomaensis*, *Ionae vitae Sanctorum Columbani, Vedastis, Iohannis*, ed. Bruno Krusch, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicum in usum scholarum* 37 (Hannover: Hahn, 1905), c. 20, 343.

⁴⁵ In Jonas’ texts, fear or confusion is not completely absent from the visionary experiences of the saintly (the main exception being Bertulf, see below). However, most visions produce joy, if any emotion is connected to them in the description at all. In addition to the premonitory dream of St. Columbanus’s mother—for which, see Jonas, *Vita Columbani abbatis discipulorumque eius libri II*, *Ionae Vitae Sanctorum Columbani, Vedastis, Iohannis*, ed. Bruno Krusch, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicum in usum scholarum* 37 (Hannover: Hahn, 1905), c. 1.2, 152–154—they are all premonitions of imminent death had by blessed monks and nuns; see Jonas, *Vita Columbani*, 2.6, 239; 2.11, 258; 2.18, 270; 2.25, 291.

⁴⁶ On monastic communities, restraint, humility, and authority, see John Cassian, as interpreted by Conrad Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 47–55. Rosenwein interestingly notes that the community of courtier-ecclesiasts she connects Jonas with was significantly conscious of hierarchies and the consequent need for deference; see Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 138–142.

how he was woken up by his shaken and scared abbot, Bertulf, who asked him if he had seen anyone appear. When Jonas said that he had not, the abbot fell silent, and only after insistent inquiry divulged that he had seen St. Peter in a vision. Jonas adds that had Bertulf immediately realised he had seen a vision, he would not have spoken at all.⁴⁷ This story shows no connection with the ideal, if such it was, of tranquil holy visions. It seems, however, to reflect the tension between the desire to interpret an experience on the one hand and the pressure not to appear to be bragging about one's divine experiences on the other. The most telling example of this need for communal humility may be that of the *Vita Iohannis*, in which a monk, assigned to keep watch at night, witnesses a frightening celestial vision towards the morning, and goes and reports this to his superior only to be bluntly told that he should not dare to think he was ever worthy to witness such things.⁴⁸ While I think humility is clearly the main issue here, I wonder if the fact that the monk was frightened by the vision was also a reason for his experience being dismissed.

If a preference for non-frightening true visions in these texts seems probable, if not quite categorical,⁴⁹ the opposite—self-control and constancy before demonic apparitions—appears to be better evidenced. St. Columbanus was confronted by disquieting *cogitationes*, a pack of wolves, and passing *Suevi*, and was unsure if they were real or illusory. However, he protected himself with the sign of the cross and, remaining “interritus” (‘unafraid’), overcame these visions “per constantiam” (‘through constancy’).⁵⁰ The idea that the anonymous late seventh-century *Vita Wandregiseli abbatis Fontanellensis* was probably intended

⁴⁷ Jonas, *Vita Columbani*, 2.23, 283; see also 2.16, 266–268. Cf. similarly St. Radegund, who Baudovinia portrays (around 600) as sharing her (tranquil) visionary experiences only with those closest to her; see Baudovinia, *Vita II S. Radegundis*, ed. Bruno Krusch, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 2 (Hannover: Hahn, 1888), 380, 391; similarly, St. Balthild in her late seventh-century *Life*; see *Vita S. Balthildis*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 2, 498.

⁴⁸ Jonas, *Vita Iohannis*, c. 16, 338: “Nequaquam talia te vel corde tumido vidisse praesumas narrare! Quid enim fas est, ut homo sub fragilitate positus et contagione peccatorum maculatus mereatur caelestia contemplare?”

⁴⁹ Note that, as Rosenwein observes, “fear alone was a uniformly positive emotion” for St. Columbanus and the “Neustrian courtiers” following him: Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 160.

⁵⁰ Jonas, *Vita Columbani*, 1.8, 166–167.

for ascetic edification⁵¹ is suggested by the way the text deals at length with the saint's problems with demonic disturbances (*inquietudines*) and visionary attacks (*impugnationes*), which the saint overcomes with the help of psalms.⁵² He receives angelic visions, one of which is described as producing immense and terrible light, but in which the angel wishes him peace. The same story also warns against pride, describing how the saint begins to feel good about the vision, but then reminds himself that he is a sinner and not worthy of such visitations.⁵³ Finally, at the end of his life, the Devil tries to harass him once more, attempting to "create fear in the soul by his horrible blacknesses,"⁵⁴ but God intervenes, and the saint's death is accompanied by a peaceful and happy crowd of saints. In this text disturbed and frightening demonic experiences are clearly contrasted with tranquil holy visions,⁵⁵ in a way that suggests the influence of Anthony's model or similar ideas.

In this section, I have examined some instances in which true visionary experiences appear to have been generally imagined to be peaceful, and in which fear seems to have been marked as an emotion of demonic illusions, or as an inferior (and temporary) response to a true vision. I suggest that such attitudes might follow from adherence to the model set by Athanasius's St. Anthony, since these narratives are centred on ascetic or even eremitical communities. However, apparently this model is never completely dominant, and at times appears to be only partially relevant. Fear clearly had its uses, which results in

⁵¹ See Felice Lifshitz, *The Norman Conquest of Pious Neustria: Historiographic Discourse and Saintry Relics 684–1090* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1995), 221–224. Cf. Marc van Uytenghe, "L'hagiographie et son public à l'époque mérovingienne," in *Papers presented to the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1975*, Part 2, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone, *Studia Patristica* 16, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altkristlichen Literatur 129 (Berlin: 1985), 54–62, at 56. On the "Columbanian" connections of this text, see Ian Wood, "The *Vita Columbani* and Merovingian Hagiography," *Peritia* 1 (1982): 63–80, at 68–69. Cf. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 170–171.

⁵² *Vita Wandregiseli abbatis Fontanellensis*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 5, ed. Bruno Krusch (Hannover: Hahn, 1905), c. 8, 16–17.

⁵³ *Vita Wandregiseli*, c. 12, 18–19.

⁵⁴ *Vita Wandregiseli*, c. 19, 23: "per suas nigridinis teterrimas pauore animae generare."

⁵⁵ The idea that this scheme pertains only to the saintly experience—and that even this clean scheme might have been disrupted had the text contained any more anecdotes—is suggested by the fact that an audition connected to the saint's death provokes terror in a monk, *Vita Wandregiseli*, c. 19, 23.

some ambiguity, both for the modern reader and, I suggest, for early medieval Christians. We must now turn to the other uses of fear.

The Cultic Model

In this section, I examine stories which ostensibly exhibit a set of ideas that are the opposite of the Antonian model. These ideas stress fear or even terror as an essential emotion in significant dreams and visions, and I have decided to term them 'cultic,' as they are connected to the tradition of Latin cultic literature, as well as, to no small degree, the Bible. At the risk of generalising, this complex of ideas might be considered the dominant one in the medieval period, in contrast to the minority views discussed in the preceding section. I shall suggest that the preponderance of these ideas in some texts is due to the nature and purpose of these texts, which are intended to promote (specific) relic cults.

Gregory of Tours (ca. 538–594) most often portrays fear and terror as the emotions experienced in connection with visions. He presents both fear of the demonic—which he also regards to be unproductive and harmful⁵⁶—and fear of the divine. While Anthony considered this fear a simple sign of deference on the part of the infirm, which in real visions would be replaced with peace and love, for Gregory it is a strong and sometimes unrelenting element of a true visionary experience. Rosenwein has connected fear especially with the cult of St. Martin,⁵⁷ although in Gregory's stories fear is by no means limited to that cult. As I have mentioned above, in some of Gregory's vision stories that include the portrayal of what can be understood as deferential fear, the apparition, as the literary model preferred by

⁵⁶ Gregory of Tours, *Liber in gloria martyrum*, ed. B. Krusch, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 1:2 (Hannover: Hahn, 1885), c. 28, 504–505, Gregory of Tours, *Liber vitae patrum*, in the same volume, 5.3, 679 and 16.3, 726.

⁵⁷ See Barbara H. Rosenwein, "The Places and Spaces of Emotion," in *Uomo e spazio nell'alto medioevo*, 4–8 aprile 2002, Settimane di Studio sull'Alto Medioevo (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 2003), 505–532, at 517–522. For Gregory's "emotional community" in general, see Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 100–129. On different attitudes to the veneration of saints, see Peter Brown, "Enjoying the Saints in Late Antiquity," *Early Medieval Europe* 9 (2000): 1–24. Deferential fear of the saints might be inversely proportional to their perceived degree of imitability.

Anthony, dismisses the fear with a “noli timere.”⁵⁸ Some other stories imply a similar pattern.⁵⁹ This pattern is far from universal, however. Other anecdotes suggest that healing miracles and the visions which sometimes accompanied them in particular were not always pleasant experiences, at least at St. Martin’s shrine, but involved “pavor” (‘fear’).⁶⁰ Of course, visions accompanied by healings could have been considered unproblematic, as the healings were often proof enough of the power of a saint’s holiness (*virtus*).⁶¹ However, fear appears to be so important that one wonders if it was not considered to be an authenticating sign⁶² by which one recognised a real, true, visionary experience. For example, it seems that Gregory’s own dream of the ill intentions of Eberulf, a troublesome asylum seeker he sheltered, is considered to be true and “divinatory” precisely because the dream makes him “valde molestus” (‘very troubled’) and he wakes up from it “pavore conterritus” (‘shaken by fear’).⁶³

⁵⁸ See Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum decem*, ed. W. Arndt, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 1:1 (Hannover: Hahn, 1885), 2.23, 85 and (if not a dream) 10.24, 435–436.

⁵⁹ Gregory of Tours, *Libri IV de virtutibus S. Martini*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 1:2, 3.23, 638, where a mute man receives an apparition of a man in episcopal robes and is “pavore perterritus”. Only after he is healed—and awake—does he shout out his gratitude.

⁶⁰ Gregory of Tours, *Libri IV de virtutibus S. Martini*, 2.26, 618–619, and 2.31, 620. In both instances, Gregory narrates how a supplicant, in the first case asleep and in the second awake, was struck with an unknown terror, “nescio quo terrore concutitur,” when healed. In the first case, the nature of the vision is left open.

⁶¹ See generally Raymond Van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 82–115, and Isabel Moreira, *Dreams, Visions and Spiritual Authority in Merovingian Gaul* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), esp. 131–135. In principle, even healing shrines were not absolutely safe places for visions, as in the case of the epileptic Landulf, whom demons tried to lead astray by appearing as St. Martin at his shrine; see Gregory of Tours, *Libri IV de virtutibus S. Martini*, 2.18, 615 and Keskiaho, “The Handling and Interpretation,” 231–232.

⁶² Cf., e.g., Gerd Althoff, “Empörung, Tränen, Zerknirschung. ‘Emotionen’ in der öffentlichen Kommunikation des Mittelalters,” *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 30 (1996): 60–79, at 67 and 75, on the communicative functions of extreme emotions. Cf. however Stuart Airlie, “The History of Emotions and Emotional History,” *Early Medieval Europe* 10 (2001): 235–241, at 237.

⁶³ Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum decem*, 7.22, 304. Cf. Giselle de Nie, *Views from a Many-Windowed Tower: Studies of Imagination in the Works of Gregory of Tours* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987), 269–272, and Giselle de Nie, “Gregory of Tours’ Smile: Spiritual Reality, Imagination and Earthly Events in the ‘Histories,’” in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelreiter, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Geschichtsforschung 32 (Wien: R. Oldenbourg, 1994), 68–95, at

Admonitory dreams form a special category of terrifying dream, in which the terror provoked is often explained through the narration of the guilt of the dreamer.⁶⁴ In such cases, the strong emotional reaction portrayed reinforces, in its own circular way, the dream-story itself. However, terror does not always reflect guilt. For example, a cleric who was unable to reach the tomb of St. Julian because of the crowds around it, retiring to his lodgings aggrieved and falling asleep, was confronted in his dream by the saint, who told him that he should return to the shrine and trust that everything would work out. For no explicit reason, the cleric woke up “metu territus” (‘shaken by fear’), and hastened to the shrine to find the crowds diminished and the way to the tomb free, which produced a feeling of thankful joy in him.⁶⁵ Although the cleric could have been seen to be guilty of a lack of zeal for the festivities of Julian’s feast, this possibility is not emphasised in the story. The idea that fear was a socially acceptable motivator for the actions of the dreamer—and in this function served also to legitimate the dream experience—is suggested by cases where the admonition is given to someone other than the person who is in a position to act in accordance with the command.⁶⁶ The power politics connected with the relic cults, especially, both engendered and perhaps also required strong emotions.⁶⁷

91–92. On Gregory’s stories of his own dreams and visions, see Moreira, *Dreams, Visions*, 84–87.

⁶⁴ For straightforward retributive nightmares, see Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum decem*, 3.36, 139, and Gregory of Tours, *Liber vitae patrum*, 4.2, 675; for terrifying admonitory dreams see 8.11, 700–701, and Gregory of Tours, *Liber in gloria confessorum*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 1:2, c. 18, 757–758; Gregory of Tours, *Libri IV de virtutibus S. Martini*, 3.42, 642–643. Cf. de Nie, *Views*, 269–287. Not all descriptions of admonitory dreams include descriptions of the emotions of the dreamer. However, such cases do contain an “objective” element of coercion, an illness that strikes the misappropriator of relics, for example. Thus, there is no need for the oneiric terror to motivate the actions of the dreamer—although even in these dreams the oneiric figures often come with terrifying or wrathful countenances. See Gregory of Tours, *Liber in gloria martyrum*, c. 47, 520–521; *Libri IV de virtutibus S. Martini*, 1.35, 605; *Liber in gloria confessorum*, c. 17, 757.

⁶⁵ Gregory of Tours, *Liber de Virtutibus S. Iuliani*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 1:2, c. 28, 576. See also Rosenwein, “The Places and Spaces,” 512.

⁶⁶ Gregory of Tours, *Liber in Gloria Martyrum*, c. 22, 501, c. 50, 523, c. 77, 540.

⁶⁷ Cf. Rosenwein, “The Places and Spaces,” 524–526, and on the politics in general Raymond Van Dam, *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 207–208 and van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles*, 78–79; Ian Wood, “Topographies of Holy Power in Sixth-Century Gaul,” in *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Mayke de Jong and Frans

In my examination of monastic or ascetic texts, above, we saw a little ambiguity about the role of fear in visions, but this seems more palpable in Gregory's stories. Given the possibility of both terrifying admonitory dreams and demonic disturbances, how could one tell the two apart? It was necessary to do so, as the former were to be obeyed and the latter rejected, the former feared and the latter not. Gregory implies that his instinctive reaction to an unwanted, perhaps disturbing dream would have been to cross himself and try to sleep again—to treat it, in other words, as an illusion—until some other phenomenon, such as the dream's repetition, convinced him otherwise.⁶⁸ As fear impaired one's judgement, the proper way of treating dreams and visions was, ideally, with composure⁶⁹—unless they turned out to be true.

In the *Dialogi* of Gregory the Great, terror of the holy is also present.⁷⁰ However, this type of fear appears in the context of waking visions, not

Theuws with Carine van Rhijn, *The Transformation of the Roman World* 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 137–154 and Ian Wood, "Constructing Cults in Early Medieval France: Local Saints and Churches in Burgundy and the Auvergne 400–1000," in *Local Saints and Local Cults in The Early Medieval West* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 155–187, at 159.

⁶⁸ See Gregory of Tours, *Liber in gloria martyrum*, c. 86, 546, where Gregory tells of how he once left Christmas vigils and fell asleep, and was repeatedly admonished by an oneiric figure to rise and return to the church. Twice, Gregory simply crossed himself and fell back asleep, until a third appearance, accompanied with violence, filled him with fear and made him comply. Likewise, the sign of the cross was recommended to King Theoderic, driven out of his wits by a nightmare while he was laying siege to Rodez, but this turned out to be a divine chastisement, brought on by the protection of the city's saints; see Gregory of Tours, *Liber vitae patrum*, 4.2, 675. On the repetition of dreams as an authenticating principle, see Keskiaho, "The Handling and Interpretation," 234–237 and 240; Van Egmond, "Saintly Images," 234–235. This notion appears as early as the Invention of St. Stephen; see Lucian of Caphargamala, "Revelatio Sancti Stephani (BHL 7850–6)," ed. S. Vanderlinden, *Revue des études byzantines* 4 (1946): 178–217, at 200–201; as noted by Dulaey, *Le rêve*, 148–149. See also Amat, *Songes et visions*, 287 n. 145.

⁶⁹ See the way the epileptic Landulf dealt with the false Martin that appeared to him, Gregory of Tours, *Libri IV de virtutibus S. Martini*, 2.18, 615 and Keskiaho, "The Handling and Interpretation," 231–232. See also the roughly contemporary text by Dinamius Patricius, *Vita Sancti Maximi Regiensis episcopi*, *Patrologia Latina* 80 (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1863), 34.

⁷⁰ See, in addition to the instances discussed below, Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, 4.49.1–3, 168–170, and perhaps also 4.49.7, 172. Cf. Gregory the Great, *Moralia*, 5.30.53, 254–255: "Humana etenim mens quo altius eleuata, quae sint aeterna considerat, eo de factis temporalibus grauius tremefacta formidat; quia tanto se ream uerius cernit quanto se ab illo lumine discrepasse quod super se intermicat conspicit; sic que fit ut illuminata plus metuat quia magis aspiciat a ueritatis regula per quanta discordat; eam que graui formidine suus ipse profectus quatiat, quae prius quasi securius nihil

of dreams in the strict sense, although it is not clear whether Gregory makes any significant distinction between the two. Holy apparitions cause fear and shouting, and some lesser minds simply cannot withstand their visions, breaking down even though the visions offer words of comfort.⁷¹ Interestingly, this description of an inability to tolerate visions is almost exactly mirrored in a demonic retribution vision accompanying the sorry death of the rich and sinful Chrysarius.⁷² Frightening demonic apparitions come in Gregory's stories only to blatant or unrepentant sinners,⁷³ since the main function of these stories is to set a negative example, and in one case to a Jew, who decides to sleep in a temple of Apollo on the Via Appia. However, in the latter case, fear of—or indeed lack of belief in—the demonic does not prevent the Jew from protecting himself with the sign of the cross, which prevents the demons from touching him.⁷⁴ Such stories suggest that impassiveness in the face of the demonic, if theoretically desirable, is not of paramount importance, when compared to the importance of proper action.⁷⁵ Indeed, even Gregory's saints are not entirely impassive in the face of temptation: Benedict himself was already feeling the heat of lust when confronted with a vision of a woman, but, "ad semetipsum reuersus" ('returned to himself') through sudden grace, proceeded to inflict bodily wounds in order to erase the wounding of his mind by lustful emotions.⁷⁶ Gregory could be placed between the two models which I have abstracted, not quite clearly committed to either. This suggests that emotions have no central place in his theory of dreams. Overall, although he shared the ascetic tradition's suspicion

uidebat." The visionary experience also has an edge of danger: Gregory explains that it is caused by the body's resistance to the necessary *ekstasis* of spirit in a vision; see *Dialogues*, 3.24.1–2, 362.

⁷¹ Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, 4.13.3–4, 52–54: "Qui splendoris eorum claritate percussus, quinam illi essent emissa coepit uoce clamare... Probus... intrantes aspexit et agnouit, atque eundem stridentem uagientemque puerum consolari coepit, dicens: 'Noli timere, quia ad me sanctus Iuuenalis et sanctus Eleutherius martyres uenerunt.' Ille autem tantae uisionis nouitatem non ferens, cursu concito extra fores fugit, atque eos quos uiderat patri ac medicis nuntiauit." See also 4.16.5, 64–66.

⁷² See Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, 4.40.6–9, 142–145; 2.25, 212. The similarity of inspired to possessed behaviour became problematic in the later Middle Ages: see Nancy Caciola, *Discerning Spirits: Divine and Demonic Possession in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 75.

⁷³ See Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, 4.40.10–12, 144–146.

⁷⁴ Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, 3.7.3–9, 280–284.

⁷⁵ See also Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, 4.55, 180–182.

⁷⁶ Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, 2.2.1–2, 136–138.

of emotions, he also considered some strong emotions, such as fear of Judgement, good and purgative, and, as Barbara Rosenwein observes, appreciated emotions in moderation.⁷⁷ For the present investigation, it is important to keep in mind this ambiguity in Gregory's extremely influential *Dialogi*.

As for the importance of fear in visions, an extreme example is offered by the anonymous late seventh-century *Passio Praiecti*.⁷⁸ The text begins with an ecstatic vision on the part of the saint's mother of her son exiting her through her side accompanied by a profusion of blood. Understandably, she begins wailing, although being "insolito tremebunda" ('trembling uncharacteristically') did not prevent her from pondering the meaning of her vision. Happening by, the arch-priest Peladius interpreted the vision as meaning that her son would attain a powerful position before dying a martyr's death. At this, the woman rejoiced.⁷⁹ Barbara Rosenwein mentions this story as an example of what she has identified as the more unrestrained emotionality of the last quarter of the seventh century in Francia, which she explains with reference to restlessness created by the dissolution

⁷⁷ See Rosenwein, "The Places and Spaces," 526–530; Barbara Rosenwein, "Even the Devil (Sometimes) Has Feelings: Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages," *The Haskins Society Journal* 14 (2003): 1–14, at 3–5; Barbara Rosenwein, "Identity and Emotions in the Early Middle Ages," in *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen. Von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, ed. Walter Pohl, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 322 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), 129–137, at 134–137, and Carole Straw, "Purity and Death," in *Gregory the Great. A Symposium*, ed. John C. Cavadini (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995), 16–37. Now Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 79–99.

⁷⁸ On the text, see Wood, "The *Vita Columbani*," 68–69, and Paul Fouracre and Richard A. Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France: History and Hagiography 640–720* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 254–270, and a translation in the same volume at 271–300. For context, see also Wood, "Constructing Cults," 174–180.

⁷⁹ See *Passio Praiecti episcopi et martyris Averni*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 5, ed. Bruno Krusch (Hannover: Hahn, 1910), c. 1, 226–227. The saint is portrayed as using the vision to argue for his episcopal election; see cc. 12–13, 232–233. Other visions and dreams in the text are tranquil; see c. 19, 237; c. 37, 246–247. On this and other such visions and dreams of pregnant women, see Moreira, "Dreams and Divination," 634–641; and Keskiaho, "The Handling and Interpretation," 241–244. From the same "emotional community" (as analysed by Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 162–189), the *Vita S. Geretrudis* relates how the saint was "pavore perterrita" by a vision of a flaming sphere descending over her; see *Vita S. Geretrudis*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 2, 458.

of Merovingian political power.⁸⁰ From the point of view of classical and Christian oneirocritical theories, it is striking that such a disturbing vision is portrayed as a meaningful revelation. Although this is a single instance, and the vision of a laywoman, one might contrast it with the ascetic value systems exhibited by the *Vita Wandregiseli*, analysed above. However, in the context of Gregory of Tours' stories, the strong emotional reaction provoked by the vision could be understood to reinforce its truth-value.

In this section, I have discussed some cases of strong emotional responses, mainly fear, to true visionary experiences. Most of these occur in the miracle-stories collected by Gregory of Tours, and, I would argue, are connected to the preoccupation of these texts with promoting, managing and celebrating relic cults. In these texts, fear is a proper reaction to the appearance to the faithful of entities of such an exalted stature as the saints, and perhaps also useful in motivating social action in accordance with the needs of cultic leaders. The *Dialogi* of Gregory the Great, on the other hand, is situated between the two abstract models I have outlined: the text has no single cultic focus, and no clear preponderance of fear in true visions. Although Gregory's saints are not exactly impassive, his works contain something that resembles an ascetical value system: the most emotional visionaries are laymen and sinners. Finally, I considered an anecdote from the *Passio Praiecti* that seems to suggest that true dreams could be terrifying even outside any clearly defined existing cultic context.

The Emotions in Dreams and Visions in Anglo-Latin Texts

In the preceding sections, I have explored what I have identified as the two main attitudes to the importance of emotions, mainly fear and its absence, in Christian dreams and visions. Naturally, this division is an abstraction, and in theoretical terms its opposite poles can be located in the contemporary ideas of Athanasius's St. Anthony and St. Ambrose. However, it also seems clear that the divisions were rarely clear-cut in narratives. One reason for this is surely that the relationship between theoretical models or belief systems concerning emotions on the one

⁸⁰ See Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Even the Devil," 7; and Rosenwein, "Pouvoir et passion," 1287–1290.

hand and emotional tastes on the other is not quite straightforward.⁸¹ I would also argue that the fact that two of the most influential Latin theologians of the patristic era appear to have disregarded the importance of emotions in oneiric phenomena must have had an effect. In the following, I shall examine some Anglo-Latin texts more closely⁸² in order to develop my argument that the type of religious expression discussed in a text—ascetic life or relic cult—affected its representation of emotions. Anglo-Latin culture, surviving to us in texts written by members of an elite who had only recently been converted and were concerned with acquiring, developing and reforming a universal Christian identity for the English,⁸³ offers a revealing point of comparison for some of the Continental texts we have examined so far.

The two prose lives of St. Cuthbert (the anonymous text composed around 700 and Bede's rewriting from around 721) portray the protagonist quite in the mould of Anthony in his reactions to visions and illusions, albeit in different ways. In the anonymous text, Cuthbert

⁸¹ See Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, e.g., 196.

⁸² Note that Aldhelm does not portray emotions in connection with the dreams he narrates. See Aldelmi Malmesbiriensis prosa *De virginitate cum glosa Latina atque Anglosaxonica*, ed. S. Gwara, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 124A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), 297–321 and 335–349; Aldhelmus, *De virginitate carmen*, ed. R. Ehwald, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 15 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1919), lines 595–650 and 715–729.

⁸³ This is not necessarily to claim, as the traditional argument runs, that Anglo-Saxons had better schools or a higher level of ecclesiastical civilisation than the contemporary Frankish world at the turn of the eighth century; see, e.g., Pierre Riché, *Éducation et culture dans l'Occident barbare VI^e–VIII^e siècle*, 4th ed. (sine loco: Éditions du Seuil, 1962), 303–325, and cf. Yitzhak Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul A.D. 481–751* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), e.g., 2–20. Rather, my point focuses on the surviving texts, and the small group of undeniably highly educated ecclesiasts evidenced by them. More significant than education is a drive to identity construction through reform; a need to seek out authoritative Christian ideals—and, importantly, a tendency to find them in patristic texts, most importantly those of St. Gregory, who was seen to have given the English their Christian identity. See, e.g., Alan Thacker, "Monks, Preaching and Pastoral Care in Early Anglo-Saxon England," in *Pastoral Care Before the Parish*, ed. John Blair and Richard Sharpe (London: Leicester University Press, 1992), 137–170, esp. 152–160; Patrick Wormald, "The Venerable Bede and the 'Church of the English'," in *The English Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism: Studies in Commemoration of the Second Centenary of John Keble* (Wantage: Ikon Productions, 1992), 13–21, now in Patrick Wormald, *The Times of Bede. Studies in Early English Christian Society and its Historian*, ed. Stephen Baxter (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006), 207–228, esp. 210–211; Anton Scharer, "The Gregorian Tradition in Early England," in *St. Augustine and the Conversion of England*, ed. Richard Gameson (Phoenix Mill: Sutton Publishing, 1999), 187–201; John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 179.

meets both angels and demons “intrepida mente” (‘with undaunted mind’), while Bede, who includes all the episodes from the earlier text without much change, drops this specification.⁸⁴ However, Bede does sharpen the contrast between the saint’s composure and the “inconstantia” (‘inconstancy’) of the regular faithful, amending a story of how the devil deceived village folk with a phantasmal fire while the saint was preaching on satanic illusions to specify that it was only after Cuthbert intervened and dissipated the phantasm that the people realised they had been deceived.⁸⁵ While both texts would seem to fit into the pattern of which I have claimed the *Vita S. Antonii* as the most prominent example, Bede’s version does seem to tone down the immovability of the saint⁸⁶ while emphasising the emotionality of the laity. These changes in emphasis may be due to Bede’s wider pastoral interest compared with the mainly monastic life of the anonymous writer.⁸⁷

Felix’s *Vita S. Guthlaci*, written most probably in the 730s,⁸⁸ follows the Antonian model of visionary experiences even more clearly

⁸⁴ Angels: “Vita Sancti Cuthberti auctore anonymo,” in *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert*, ed. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), 1.4, 66–68; 1.5, 68–70; 2.2, 76; demons: 3.1, 96. See the same episodes in Bede, *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*, in the same volume, c. 2, 158–160; c. 4, 164–166; c. 7, 176 and c. 18, 214. Bede drops the specification of Cuthbert’s fearlessness. Cf. the corresponding passages in his earlier, metrical *Vita: Bedas metrische Vita sancti Cuthberti*, ed. Werner Jaeger (Leipzig: Mayer & Müller, 1935), 67–68, 73–74, 87–88. The only difference is in the passage where an angel visits Cuthbert and leaves him bread: in the prose lives (76, 176), he is stupefied when he realises the miracle; in the metrical life (73–74), he is at first afraid, but later remembers the experience with joy—if there is a distinction, the passage is more a miracle rather than a vision.

⁸⁵ Bede, *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*, c. 13, 198; cf. the anonymous *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*, 2.6, 86–88; *Bedas metrische*, 82.

⁸⁶ Note also that, while neither text really portray’s Cuthbert’s ecstatic vision of the death of a brother while dining with Abbess Ælflæd as emotional per se, Bede’s version is slightly more dramatic: cf. *Vita Sancti Cuthberti auctore anonymo*, 4.10, 126 with Bede, *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*, c. 34, 262.

⁸⁷ On Bede’s version, see Carole E. Newlands, “Bede and Images of Saint Cuthbert,” *Traditio* 52 (1997): 73–109; W. Trent Foley, “Suffering and Sanctity in Bede’s *Prose Life of St. Cuthbert*,” *The Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 50 (1999): 102–116; and more generally Catherine Cubitt, “Memory and Narrative in the Cult of Early Anglo-Saxon Saints,” in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 29–66.

⁸⁸ See Theodor Wolpers, *Die englische Heiligenlegende des Mittelalters. Eine Formgeschichte des Legendenerzählens von der spätantiken lateinischen Tradition bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Buchreihe der Anglia 10 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1964), 83–94; Walter Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter II: Merowingische Biographie; Italien, Spanien und die Inseln im frühen Mittelalter*,

than the anonymous *Vita S. Cuthberti*, and quite clearly directly follows St. Anthony.⁸⁹ Guthlac is harassed by demonic temptations which are clearly based on St. Anthony's example, and the text juxtaposes terrifying and disturbing demonic visions, which the saint bears with constancy, with the joyful calm brought by the arrival of his patron and protector, St. Bartholomew.⁹⁰ The character who is frightened by a holy vision is King Æthelbald of Mercia, who sees the saint in a terrible vision, but is immediately comforted, in accordance with the Antonian model.⁹¹ In fact, the correspondence is so striking that one wonders if it is not due simply to extensive borrowing from the *Vita S. Antonii*. However, whether intentional or not, the ideas are there to read in the finished product, further influencing its readers' ideas about visions and emotions. That said, given that the *Vita S. Antonii* was avidly read and was among the standard model texts used by early medieval hagiographers,⁹² the fact that not all who used it adopted these ideas about emotions and visions would suggest that Felix's reproduction of them is intentional.

When emotions are described at all in connection with dreams and visions in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, completed in 731, fear has its place, but a less extreme one than in the Continental examples we have seen. For the most part, it seems that it is laymen and pagans that respond most emotionally, something that accords not only with the

Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters 9 (Stuttgart: Anton Hierseemann, 1988), 301–303; and also Gernot Wieland, "Aures Lectoris: Orality and Literacy in Felix's *Vita Sancti Guthlaci*," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 7 (1997): 168–177, where it is argued that the text shows signs of having been designed to be read aloud and to be paraphrased in the vernacular. Given the subject matter of the life, I would see it as having been intended for the use of ascetic communities, although perhaps its general entertainment value should not be underestimated.

⁸⁹ See Benjamin Kurtz, *From St. Antony to St. Guthlac: A Study in Biography*, University of California Publications in Modern Philology 12:2 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1926), esp. 111–116. Generally also Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil* 2, 304: "Das Leben des englischen Antonius."

⁹⁰ Felix, *Felix's Life of St. Guthlac*, ed. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), c. 29, 94–98: "tum miles Christi totis sensibus turbatus de eo...desperare coepit," and after Bartholomew arrives, "spirituali gaudio repletus;" c. 30, 98–100; c. 31–33, 100–108; c. 31, 106: "inmotis sensibus, stabili animo, sobria mente;" c. 34, 108–110.

⁹¹ *Felix's Life of St. Guthlac*, c. 52, 164: "cum ignota visione terreretur, extimulo beatum Guthlacum...dicentem ei 'Noli timere...'"

⁹² See Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil* 1, 120–128, 213; and Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil* 2, 29, 73, 296. Cf. however Kurtz, *From St. Antony to St. Guthlac*, 128–140.

ascetic model already discussed, but also more generally with the pre-conceptions of the Christian elite.⁹³ We are told of Bishop Laurentius, who, upset by a setback in his mission, considered fleeing for the continent. However, having retired to his church to pray for the night, he was flogged in a dream by St. Peter. Beforehand, the dreamer had cried “*lacrimas pro statu ecclesiae*” (‘tears at the situation of the Church’), but it is the king of Kent who responds with appropriate fear when Laurentius shows him the welts on his back.⁹⁴ Like the chastisement of Laurentius, the vision described by Bede in which demons show an unrepentant sinner his name in the book of the damned is, understandably, terrifying.⁹⁵

More interesting are visions that, as in Gregory of Tours, are met with fear despite the lack of any manifestly frightening content. We are told that Edwin, a pagan at the time of the events described, was terrified (“*non parum expauit*”) by the vision he experienced while an exile in Rædwald’s court.⁹⁶ Interestingly, the Whitby *Liber Beati Gregorii* recounts a version of the same story where a beautiful apparition brings

⁹³ Worldly (or simply non-elite) Christians’ irrational fear was a well rooted theological idea, see Knuuttila, *Emotions*, 116. Donald A. Bullough, *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation. Being Part of the Ford Lectures Delivered in Oxford in Hilary Term 1980* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 138, notes that Alcuin and his contemporaries entertained a stereotype of hysterical *rustici* who were afraid of the dark and the terrors of the night. See, e.g., *Vita Alcuini*, ed. W. Arndt, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum 15 (Hannover: Hahn, 1887), c. 2, 185–186; cf. Alcuin, *Commentaria super Ecclesiasten*, Patrologia Latina 101 (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1863), 5.6, 689B: “Cum enim diversa videris per nocturnam quietem, et variis anima fuerit exagitata terroribus sive incitata promissis, tu contemne, quia somnia sunt, et solum Deum time,” directly quoting Hieronymus, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 72 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1959), 5.6, 293. I have not, however, been able to discern a clear social division of the sort identified by Michel Lauwers, “La mort et le corps des saints. La scène de la mort dans les Vitae du haut Moyen Age,” *Le Moyen Age* 104 = 5th series 2 (1988): 21–50, at 37–39.

⁹⁴ Bede, *Histoire ecclésiastique du peuple Anglais* (*Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*), ed. Michael Lapidge, ed. and trans. André Crepin et al., 3 vols., Sources Chrétiennes 489–491 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2005), 2.6.1, 318–322 (hereafter HE). From time to time, Laurentius gets discussed as an example of Christian incubation. See Ludwig Deubner, *De incubatione capita quattuor* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1900), 57–58. The problem is that the story does not indicate whether Laurentius sought a vision, or simply intended to hold a vigil; see, e.g., the comments by A. Crépin (in Bede, HE, 318–320). On related problems of interpretation, see also Hippolyte Delehaye, “Les recueils antiques de miracles des saints,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 43 (1925): 5–85, 305–25, at 322–324.

⁹⁵ Bede, HE, 5.13, 84–90.

⁹⁶ Bede, HE, 2.12, 352–358.

comfort to the anxious exile.⁹⁷ However, like Bede's story of the nuns of Barking, who are frightened by a cloth of light that descends among them in the monastic cemetery,⁹⁸ his tale of Edwin is not portrayed as a dream, and an explanation might be that, rather than a sign of reverence, fear is being presented here as the stereotypical sign of a miracle. As Bishop Aidan's alarm when King Oswine humbled himself before him suggests, fear is the proper response to a breakdown in the natural order.⁹⁹ These ambiguities are a good example of the problems in grasping the meaning of emotions connected with dreams and visions, especially in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*. While hagiographical stories generally portray such phenomena less as natural and more as miraculous, indeed blurring the distinction between the two, the *Historia ecclesiastica* lacks the hagiographical focus of an individual saint's life centred on and conditioned by the figure of a single saint.

In general, even most of the "fragili" ('those brittle in their faith')—like the boy "nuper uocatus ad fidem" ('lately called to the Faith') who was visited by St. Peter and St. Paul in a peaceful vision—enjoyed non-frightening dreams in Bede's text.¹⁰⁰ In the story in question, the boy is afterwards asked by a priest to describe the figures, in what seems to be an effort to authenticate, to secure a Christian explanation for the event,¹⁰¹ and one of the points he makes is that their faces were very happy and beautiful ("laetissimi et pulcherrimi"). In this story, at least, the saints dispel fear and bring peace, a phenomenon which is quite in harmony with the ideas of men such as Anthony. The only holy person or member of the Christian elite that receives a frightening vision in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* is Wilfrid. The saint's own hagiographer, Stephanus, tells us how Wilfrid fell ill and the archangel Michael

⁹⁷ *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*, ed. Bertram Colgrave (Lawrence, KA: University of Kansas Press, 1968), 100: "Ea tempestate dicunt ei de sua vita consternato quadam die quidam pulchrę visionis, cum cruce Christi coronatus apparens eum consolari coepisse..." The other dreams in this text are admonitory, and include one that is finally properly taken seriously (cc. 18–19, 102–104), and one that is not, with dire consequences (c. 28, 126). In neither case is the dreamer depicted as reacting emotionally.

⁹⁸ Bede, HE, 4.7, 236–238.

⁹⁹ Bede, HE, 3.14.5–6, 86.

¹⁰⁰ Bede, HE, 4.14.3–6, 268–272; see also 4.22.2–3, 332–336.

¹⁰¹ On the appearance or images of oneiric figures as a means of authenticating dreams and visions, which, although understandable, was according to (some) theological opinions not very sound, see Keskiaho, "The Handling and Interpretation," esp. 237–239 and 245; and Van Egmond, "Sainly Images," 221–233.

appeared to him, healed him, and predicted his death in four years.¹⁰² Bede, who had met Wilfrid and not only had read Stephanus's text but also knew Bishop Acca of Hexham, a friend of the saint, tells us that the vision made Wilfrid tremble.¹⁰³ In light of the Antonian theory, one would be tempted to read this portrayal as less than favourable to Wilfrid, as it would indicate his spiritual infirmity. Indeed, Walter Goffart has argued that Bede deliberately "abased" Wilfrid in his *History*.¹⁰⁴ However, it is not altogether clear whether this is the context in which the story should be read. Although we have observed that, generally, only wrongdoers and pagans seem to have frightening visions in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, the *Vita S. Felicis*, which is also attributed to Bede, describes St. Felix having a reaction similar to Wilfrid's when he is liberated from prison by an angel.¹⁰⁵ Yet Alcuin, rewriting the Wilfrid story in verse, stresses the clemency of the divine visitation and drops the emotional response.¹⁰⁶ Perhaps Bede's version is simply more faithful to Acca's tale, and possibly even to Wilfrid's

¹⁰² *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus*, ed. Bertram Colgrave, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927), c. 56, 120–122.

¹⁰³ Bede, HE, 5.19.12, 126: "Visio mihi modo tremenda apparuit."

¹⁰⁴ See Walter Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550–800)*. *Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, 1988), 307–324. See B. Colgrave in *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, xii and, most recently, Walter Goffart, "L'Histoire ecclésiastique et l'engagement politique de Bede," in *Bede le Vénérable entre tradition et postérité. The Venerable Bede. Tradition and Posterity. Colloque organisé à Villeneuve d'Ascq et Amiens par le CRHEN-O, Université de Lille 3, et Textes, Images et Spiritualité (Université de Picardie–Jules Verne) du 3 au 6 juillet 2002* (CEGES: Lille 2005), 149–158, esp. 153–155. Goffart's views are robustly opposed by N. J. Higham, *(Re-)Reading Bede: The 'Ecclesiastical History' in Context* (London: Routledge, 2006), 63–69.

¹⁰⁵ Bede, *Beati Felicis confessoris vita*, *Patrologia Latina* 94 (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1862), 791A: "sed angelus adveniens, soli Felici, qui pietatis gratia vinctus erat, apparuit, luce splendens corusca, et ipsam quoque domum gratia lucis adimplens, cujus voce simul et luce Felix motus intremuit. Ac primum quidem se somnii imagine illudi putavit; at angelus surgere illum, et se sequi exeundo praecepit. Qui stupens ad imperium iubentis." Here, however, Bede is adapting Paulinus Nolanus, *De S. Felice natalitium carmen IV*, *Patrologia Latina* 61 (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1861), 474A, lines 238–245: "Venit ergo micans jam nocte silenti/ Angelus, et tota victorum in plebe reorum / Felicem solum, pietas cui sancta reatum / Fecerat, alloquitur: fugit atri carceris horror. / Voce simul sacri Felix et luce ministri / Excussus tremit, et verbum trahit aure fideli. / Ac primum, velut eludentis imagine somni / Accipiat mandata Dei, stupet anxius." The prose version tones the emotionality down here slightly, and ignores the implication of the original that the fear was caused by Felix initially mistaking the vision for an empty dream. Instead, the reaction is "only" trembling, caused, as in the original, by the voice of the angel.

¹⁰⁶ Alcuin, *The Bishops, Kings, and Saints of York*, ed. Peter Godman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 52–54.

experience, while the hagiographer's and Alcuin's versions certainly conform better to what one would assume the ideal to be. Or, considerations of veracity aside, perhaps Bede did not perceive Wilfrid as existing within a hagiographical framework which might have led him to consider the appropriateness of his emotional responses. Similar problems arise in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, in the account of Begu, a holy virgin in Hackness, who one night witnessed the soul of St. Hild of Whitby ascending to heaven. Waking up, and seeing the nuns asleep around her, "intellexit uel in somnio uel in uisione mentis ostensum sibi esse quod uiderat" ('she realised this had been shown to her either in a dream or a mental vision'). At this, she rose, and, "nimio terrore perterrita" ('frightened with immense terror'), ran to her abbess to tell her, amid tears, that Hild had died.¹⁰⁷ Lisa Bitel argued that Begu was frightened that what she had seen was merely an illusion,¹⁰⁸ but, while not impossible, this interpretation is not supported by the narrative, where Begu clearly knows that her vision is true. Quite apart from theological considerations, the response is quite a plausible one to the experience described. However, it may also be that Begu's terror, like that connected with the cultic visions in Gregory of Tours' work, is meant to signal the validity and importance of her dream. If so, it further hampers attempts to decide the proper interpretational context for the Wilfrid story.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, a negative connotation for fear in that story cannot be ruled out.

This section has discussed three hagiographical texts—the two lives of St. Cuthbert and that of St. Guthlac—which, as I have argued, more or less follow the Antonian model of differentiating visions (and visionaries) based on emotional criteria. I then considered Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, comparing its stories to surviving versions of some of the same stories, and analysing the problems of situating it in an ideological context with regard to emotions and dreams. The patterns of emotions in these texts should in the first instance be read as a result

¹⁰⁷ Bede, HE, 4.21.8–9, 328.

¹⁰⁸ Lisa M. Bitel, "In Visu Noctis: Dreams in European Hagiography and Histories 400–900," *History of Religions* 31 (1991): 39–59, at 52 and 56.

¹⁰⁹ It may be relevant, especially if one assumes that Bede would have held peaceful visions to be more trustworthy than frightening ones, that Begu is, like Jacob in Genesis (28:10–17) only frightened as a response to an in itself apparently calm vision. However, Anthony, for example, does not differentiate between emotions during a vision and emotions caused by a vision.

of the styling (and perception) of Cuthbert as primarily a monastic (and to a variable extent, pastoral) saint and Guthlac as primarily an anchorite. Correspondingly, the lack of any such single focus in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* would naturally result in a more ambiguous text. Furthermore, Bede was very much influenced by Gregory's *Dialogi*, which, as we saw, were at best ambiguous about the relationship between visions and emotions.¹¹⁰ I would thus suggest that this examination shows how the patterns of representations of emotions, like the choice of texts to use as models, is conditioned, if not dictated, by the "mode of religious expression" the text is focused on.¹¹¹

A further point can be made based on this examination: but for a few (ambiguous) instances, there is an absence of fear connected to true visions. I would suggest that this reflects the ideals of the largely monastic authors, audiences and subject matter of these texts. If so, this limits the evidential value of these texts as witnesses of the emotional culture of their communities. By this I mean that Lindisfarne, for example, seems to have had a lively relic cult centred around Cuthbert.¹¹² This cult would have been a part of the culture of that monastery, but was apparently not a significant part of how the community wished to memorialise the saint in written form. The dreams and visions likely associated with that cult could well have been represented differently from those now recorded, perhaps not very differently from those narrated by Gregory of Tours. Thus, we have to allow for the possibility of attitudes to dreams—and to emotions connected with them—other than those attested by our texts alone.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Wolpers, who saw the difference between Bede and the Life of Guthlac in terms of a difference between early medieval and "Benedictine" spirituality; see Wolpers, *Die englische*, 88: "Benediktinische Gemessenheit und ruhige Zusammenschau, die bei Gregor alle Bewegung übergreift und auch bei Beda dominiert, fehlt ebenso wie das sichere Gefühl des Eins und Vertrauens mit Gott... In der Guthlac-Vita walten hohe Erregung und eine elementare Frömmigkeitshaltung frühmittelalterlicher Art vor—Staunen und Erschrecken vor dem *tremendum*, Ehrfurcht vor dem gewaltigen Gott und das Bedürfnis, ihn zu ehren."

¹¹¹ So Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 202.

¹¹² Thacker, "Monks, Preaching," 166–169; Thacker, "The Making of a Local Saint," in *Local Saints and Local Cults in The Early Medieval West*, ed. Alan Thacker and Richard Sharpe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 45–73, at 70; and on the problems of evidence and cults popular and elite, see Catherine Cubitt in the same volume, "Universal and Local Saints in Anglo-Saxon England," 423–454.

Conclusion

Although emotions had a part in classical oneirological theories, they had no central or uniform place among the various ways of making sense of dreams in early medieval Christianities. One reason for this was the variable valuation of emotions in Christian contexts.¹¹³ In this article, I have focused on those instances where a connection seems to have been perceived. The comparison of Continental and Anglo-Latin texts reminds us that the modelling of emotions in our texts—at least in such clearly religious contexts as dreams—is influenced by the type of religiosity on which the texts focus.

The elimination of emotions as a prerequisite for significant visions or dreams, as proposed by some Christian ascetics, never quite caught on in the early medieval West. For the most part, such practices focused on sexuality and the elimination of sexual dreams. Those ideas and attitudes that survived mainly concerned the role of fear in Christian visionary experiences. The practice of discerning spirits based on the emotional state of the visionary was dismissed or ignored by Western theologians until the later Middle Ages,¹¹⁴ but the concept was at least transmitted in the Latin translations of the *Vita S. Antonii*. I have highlighted cases of preference for tranquil visions that seem to go back to ideas similar to those which St. Anthony offered as principles for the discernment of spirits. I have suggested that these occur mainly in ascetic texts, especially those valuing eremitical experiences.

Conversely, I have examined texts connecting fear, even terror, with holy experiences. Such ideas were well rooted in the Bible as well as in pre-Christian Latin cultic literature. I suggested that, in texts focused on the propagation and management of (individual) relic cults, the strong emotionality of dreaming had its uses. In such texts, preoccupied with competing shrines and relic cults and with teaching proper conduct to their congregations, fear had a role in motivating behaviour and perhaps even as a criterion for distinguishing between significant dreams and mundane ones. Indeed, it is clear that even outside directly cultic environments, fear could be an anticipated and perhaps even a required component of or response to true dreams. Stepping outside

¹¹³ See Knuuttila, *Emotions*, 111–176; Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, passim. Regarding dreams, cf. Stroumsa, “Dreams and Visions,” 204.

¹¹⁴ On the later Middle Ages see Caciola, *Discerning Spirits*, 129–224, cf. Switek, “‘Discretio spirituum,’” 54–70.

the narratives for a moment, a possible explanation could be that, seeing as most dreams were probably not considered significant, insistent, repeated and terrifying ones might have had an edge over more mundane ones,¹¹⁵ although this is not to imply that our texts relate tales of actual dreams. Between these two ideal poles there exists a large number of instances where the relationship between emotions and visionary phenomena is ambiguous, here discussed through examples from Bede's *Historia*. With emphasis not on any individual cult, nor the propagation of ascetic ideals, but rather exemplary Christian public life,¹¹⁶ its descriptions of dreams and visions vary between reflections of the two ideals discussed here.

All this is not meant to perpetuate old interpretations of fear as a structural part of premodern life,¹¹⁷ and it is important to note that fear has been disproportionately prominent in this article because it is the emotion most strongly connected to visionary phenomena. Even in these selected stories, fear is rarely the only emotion, nor is it often long-lasting. It instead has a range of precise meanings. Indeed, even in monastic contexts, the positive meanings of fear never disappear, because the emotion itself had variable meanings. However, in such contexts it is possible that fear as a sign of imperfection comes to fore, being mostly absent from the peaceful experience of the meritorious self-controlled ascetic. However, even holy persons were not always perfectly composed, and rustics or non-elite Christians were far from conforming to the hysterical stereotype the elites entertained throughout the period: such attitudes, like others that we have considered in this paper, had a reality, but it is the purposes of our texts (and the underlying reality to which they were connected) that affected the selection and mode of employing the available attitudes and ideas.

¹¹⁵ William V. Harris, in his Amos Anderson lecture "ONAR. Comprensione dei sogni nel mondo antico" at the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, Rome, May 31, 2006, suggested that in antiquity, it was mostly dreams of people in special circumstances, and those that were impressively terrible, that were taken seriously.

¹¹⁶ So Higham, *(Re-)Reading Bede*, e.g., 185.

¹¹⁷ See, e.g., Jean Delumeau, *La peur en occident XVI^e-XVIII^e siècles* (Paris: Fayard 1978); Peter Dinzelbacher, *Angst im Mittelalter. Teufels-, Todes- und Gottese Erfahrung: Mentalitätsgeschichte und Ikonographie*, (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1996) and the criticism by Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 6.

Works Cited

Primary sources

- Alcuin. 1982. *The Bishops, Kings, and Saints of York*. Ed. Peter Godman. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1863. *Commentaria super Ecclesiasten*. Patrologia Latina 101. Paris: J.-P. Migne.
- Aldhelmus. 1919. *De virginitate carmen*. Ed. R. Ehwald, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 15. Berlin: Weidmann.
- . 2001. *Aldhelmi Malmesbiriensis prosa De virginitate cum glosa Latina atque Anglosaxonica*. Ed. S. Gwara, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 124A. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Ambrosius Mediolanensis. 1897. *De Abraham*. Ed. Carolus Schenkl, Sancti Ambrosii Opera 1:1, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 32:1. Prague: Academia litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis.
- Ambrosius Theodorus Macrobius. 1963. *Commentarii in somnium Scipionis*, ed. Jacob Willis. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Arndt, W., ed. 1887. *Vita Alcuini*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores 15. Hannover: Hahn.
- Athanase d'Alexandrie. 1994. *Vie d'Antoine*. Ed. G. J. M. Bartelink, Sources Chrétiennes 400. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Athanasius. 1974. *Vita di Antonio*. Ed. Bartelink, G. J. M., trans. Pietro Citati and Salvatore Lilla, introduction Christine Mohrmann. Sine loco: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla/Arnaldo Mondadori Editore.
- . 1879. *Vita Beati Antonii abbatis... interprete Evagrio presbytero Antiocheno*. Ed. Rosweyde, Patrologia Latina 73. Paris: Fratres Garnier.
- Augustinus. 1865. *Sermones*. Patrologia Latina 38. Paris: J.-P. Migne.
- . 1894. *De Genesi ad litteram*. Ed. J. Zycha, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 28. Prague: Academia litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis.
- . 1955. *De civitate Dei libri I–X & XI–XII*. Ed. Bernard Dombart and Alfons Kalb, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 47–48. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 1981. *Confessionum libri XII*. Ed. Lucas Verheijen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 27. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Baudovinia. 1888. *Vita II S. Radegundis*. Ed. Bruno Krusch, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 2. Hannover: Hahn.
- Bede. 1862. *Beati Felicis confessoris vita*. Patrologia Latina 94. Paris: J.-P. Migne.
- . 1935. *Bedas metrische Vita sancti Cuthberti*. Ed. Werner Jaeger. Leipzig: Mayer & Müller.
- . 2005. *Histoire ecclésiastique du peuple Anglais (Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum)*. Ed. Michael Lapidge, ed. and trans. André Crepin et al., 3 vols., Sources Chrétiennes 489–491. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Martinus Bracarensis. 1950. *Sententiae Patrum Aegyptiorum*. Ed. Claude W. Barlow, Martini episcopi Bracarensis opera omnia. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Colgrave, Bertram, ed. 1940. *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , ed. 1968. *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*. Lawrence, KA: University of Kansas Press.
- Dinamius Patricius. 1863. *Vita Sancti Maximi Regiensis episcopi*. Patrologia Latina 80. Paris: J.-P. Migne.
- Eddius. 1927. *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus*. Ed. Bertram Colgrave. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Felix. 1956. *Felix's Life of St. Guthlac*. Ed. Bertram Colgrave. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gregorius Magnus. 1979. *Moralia in Iob*. Ed. Marcus Adriaen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 143. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 1980. *Dialogues*. Vol. 3, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, Sources Chrétiennes 265. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Gregory of Tours. 1885. *Liber in gloria martyrum*. Ed. B. Krusch, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 1:2. Hannover: Hahn.
- . 1885. *Libri historiarum decem*. Ed. W. Arndt, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 1:1. Hannover: Hahn.
- Hieronymus. 1959. *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*. Ed. Marcus Adriaen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 72. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Jonas. 1905. *Vita Iohannis abbatis Reomaensis*. Iona vitae Sanctorum Columbani, Vedastis, Iohannis, ed. Bruno Krusch, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicum in usum scholarum 37. Hannover: Hahn.
- Johannes Cassianus. 2004. *Collationes XXIII*. Ed. Michael Petschenig, 2nd ed. Gottfried Kreuz, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 13. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Krusch, Bruno, ed. 1905. *Vita Wandregiseli abbatis Fontanellensis*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 5. Hannover: Hahn.
- , ed. 1910. *Passio Praiecti episcopi et martyris Averni*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 5. Hannover: Hahn.
- Lactantius. 1890. *Divinae institutiones*. Ed. Samuel Brandt, L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 19:1. Prague: Academia Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis.
- Lucian of Caphargamala. 1946. *Revelatio Sancti Stephani* (BHL 7850–6). Vanderlinden, S. *Revue des études byzantines* 4: 178–217.
- Martine, F. ed. 1968. *Vie des pères du Jura*. Sources Chrétiennes 142. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Martinus Bracarenensis. 1950. *Sententiae Patrum Aegyptiorum*. Ed. Claude W. Barlow, Martini episcopi Bracarensis opera omnia. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Paulinus Nolanus. 1861. *De S. Felice natalitium carmen IV*. Patrologia Latina 61. Paris: J.-P. Migne.
- Pelagius and Johannes. 1879. *Verba seniorum*. Ed. Rosweyde, Patrologia Latina 73. Paris: Fratres Garnier.
- Rufinus Aquileiensis. 1878. *Historia monachorum*. Patrologia Latina 21. Paris: Fratres Garnier.
- Sulpicius Severus. 1967. *Vie de Saint Martin*, vol. 1, ed. Jacques Fontaine, Sources Chrétiennes 133. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Secondary sources

- Airlie, Stuart. 2001. The History of Emotions and Emotional History. *Early Medieval Europe* 10: 235–241.
- Althoff, Gerd. 1996. Empörung, Tränen, Zerknirschung. 'Emotionen' in der öffentlichen Kommunikation des Mittelalters. *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 30: 60–79.
- Amat, Jacqueline. 1985. *Songes et visions. L'au-delà dans la littérature latine tardive*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 109. Paris: Études augustiniennes.
- Antin, Paul. 1968. Autour du songe de S. Jérôme. In Paul Antin, *Recueil sur saint Jérôme*, 71–100. Bruxelles: Latomus, rev. from 1963. *Revue des Études latines* 41: 350–377.
- Behr, C. A. 1968. *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Berschin, Walter. 1986. *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter I: Von der Passio Perpetuae zu den Dialogi Gregors des Großen*. Quellen und Forschungen zur lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters 8. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann.

- . 1988. *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter II: Merowingische Biographie; Italien, Spanien und die Inseln im frühen Mittelalter*. Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters 9. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann.
- Bernstein, Alan E. 2000. Tristitia and the Fear of Hell in Monastic Reflection from John Cassian to Hildemar of Corbie. In *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late Medieval and Reformation History, Essays Presented to Heiko A. Oberman on his 70th Birthday*, ed. Robert J. Bast and Andrew G. Gow, 183–205. Leiden: Brill.
- Bitel Lisa M. 1991. In *Visu Noctis: Dreams in European Hagiography and Histories 400–900*. *History of Religions* 31: 39–59.
- Blair, John. 2005. *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brakke, David. 1995. The Problematization of Nocturnal Emissions in Early Christian Syria, Egypt, and Gaul. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3: 419–460.
- Brown, Peter. 2000. Enjoying the Saints in Late Antiquity. *Early Medieval Europe* 9: 1–24.
- Bullough, Donald A. 2004. *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation. Being Part of the Ford Lectures Delivered in Oxford in Hilary Term 1980*. Leiden: Brill.
- Caciola, Nancy. 2003. *Discerning Spirits: Divine and Demonic Possession in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Chadwick, Owen. 1968. *John Cassian*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. 1992. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cubitt, Catherine. 2000. Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints. *Early Medieval Europe* 9: 53–83.
- . 2000. Memory and Narrative in the Cult of Early Anglo-Saxon Saints. In *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes, 29–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. Universal and Local Saints in Anglo-Saxon England. In *Local Saints and Local Cults in The Early Medieval West*, ed. Alan Thacker and Richard Sharpe, 423–454. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Delehaye, Hippolyte. 1925. Les recueils antiques de miracles des saints. *Analecta Bollandiana* 43: 5–85, 305–325.
- Delumeau, Jean. 1978. *La peur en occident XVI^e–XVIII^e siècles*. Paris: Fayard.
- Deubner, Ludwig. 1900. *De incubatione capita quattuor*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Dingjan, Fr. 1967. *Discretio. Les origines patristiques et monastiques de la doctrine sur la prudence chez saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Dinzelbacher, Peter. 1996. *Angst im Mittelalter. Teufels-, Todes- und Gotteserfahrung: Mentalitätsgeschichte und Ikonographie*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.
- Dulaey, Martine. 1973. *Le rêve dans la vie et la pensée de saint Augustin*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 50. Paris: Études augustiniennes.
- Egmond, Wolfert van. 1999. The Audience of Early Medieval Hagiographical Texts: Some Questions Revisited. In *New Approaches to Medieval Communication*, ed. Marco Mostert, 41–68. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Foley, W. Trent. 1999. Suffering and Sanctity in Bede's *Prose Life of St. Cuthbert*. *The Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 50: 102–116.
- Fouracre, Paul and Richard A. Gerberding. 1996. *Late Merovingian France. History and Hagiography 640–720*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Gajano, Sofia Boesch. 1979. Dislivelli culturali e mediazioni ecclesiastiche nei *Dialogi* di Gregorio Magno. *Quaderni Storici* n. 41 a. 14: 398–415.
- . 2004. *Gregorio magno. Alle origini del Medioevo*. Roma: Viella.
- Godden, Malcolm R. 2001. Were It Not that I Have Bad Dreams: Gregory the Great and the Anglo-Saxons on the Dangers of Dreaming. In *Rome and the North. The Early Reception of Gregory the Great in Germanic Europe*. Ed. Rolf H. Bremmer

- Jr., Kees Dekker, and David F. Johnson, *Medievalia Groningana* 4, 93–113. Paris: Peeters.
- Goffart, Walter. 1988. *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550–800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ.
- . 2005. L'Histoire ecclésiastique et l'engagement politique de Bède. In *Bède le Vénérable entre tradition et postérité. The Venerable Bede: Tradition and Posterity. Colloque organisé à Villeneuve d'Ascq et Amiens par le CRHEN-O, Université de Lille 3, et Textes, Images et Spiritualité (Université de Picardie-Jules Verne) du 3 au 6 juillet 2002*, 149–158. CEGES: Lille.
- Hanson, John S. 1980. Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 2.23.2, ed. Wolfgang Haase, 1395–1427. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Harris, William V. 2003. Roman Opinions about the Truthfulness of Dreams. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 93: 18–34.
- Hen, Yitzhak. 1995. *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul A.D. 481–751*. Leiden: Brill.
- Higham, N. J. 2006. (Re-)Reading Bede: The 'Ecclesiastical History' in Context. London: Routledge.
- Keskiaho, Jesse. 2004. Eighth-Century Anglo-Latin Ecclesiastical Attitudes to Dreams and Visions. *Ennen ja nyt* 4.4: <<http://www.ennenjanyt.net/4-04/referee/keskiaho.pdf>>.
- . 2005. The Handling and Interpretation of Dreams and Visions in Late Sixth- to Eighth-Century Gallic and Anglo-Latin Hagiography and Histories. *Early Medieval Europe* 13: 246–247.
- Kessels, A. H. M. 1969. Ancient Systems of Dream-Classification. *Mnemosyne* 3rd series 22: 389–424.
- Knuuttila, Simo. 2004. *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kurtz, Benjamin. 1926. *From St. Antony to St. Guthlac: A Study in Biography*, University of California Publications in Modern Philology 12:2. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lauwers, Michel. 1988. La mort et le corps des saints. La scène de la mort dans les Vitae du haut Moyen Âge. *Le Moyen Âge* 104 = 5th series 2: 21–50.
- Le Goff, Jacques. 1999. Le christianisme et les rêves II^e–VII^e siècle. In *Un autre Moyen Âge. Sine loco*: Gallimard; originally in 1985. *I sogni nel medioevo. Seminario internazionale Roma, 2–4 ottobre 1983*, ed. Tullio Gregory, 689–737. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Leyser, Conrad. 2000. *Authority and Ascetism from Augustine to Gregory the Great*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lifshitz, Felice. 1995. *The Norman Conquest of Pious Neustria: Historiographic Discourse and Saintly Relics 684–1090*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Lienhard, Joseph T. 1980. On 'Discernment of Spirits' in the Early Church. *Theological Studies* 41: 505–529.
- Moreira, Isabel. 2000. *Dreams, Visions and Spiritual Authority in Merovingian Gaul*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- . 2003. Dreams and Divination in Early Medieval Canonical and Narrative Sources: The Question of Clerical Control. *The Catholic Historical Review* 89: 621–642.
- Näf, Beat. 2004. *Traum und Traumdeutung im Altertum*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Newlands, Carole E. 1997. Bede and Images of Saint Cuthbert. *Traditio* 52: 73–109.
- Nie, Giselle de. 1987. *Views from a Many-Windowed Tower: Studies of Imagination in the Works of Gregory of Tours*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- . 1994. Gregory of Tours' Smile: Spiritual Reality, Imagination and Earthly Events in the 'Histories'. In *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelreiter, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Geschichtsforschung 32. 68–95. Wien: R. Oldenbourg.
- Oberhelman, Steven M. 1983. Galen: On Diagnosis from Dreams. *Journal of the History of Medicine* 38: 36–47.
- . 1987. The Diagnostic Dream in Ancient Medical Theory and Practice. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 6: 48–53.
- . 1993. Dreams in Graeco-Roman Medicine. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 2.37.1, ed. Wolfgang Haase, 127–136. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Peden, Alison M. 1985. Macrobius and Medieval Dream Literature. *Medium Aevum* 54: 59–73.
- Refoulé, F. 1961. Rêves et vie spirituelle d'après Évagre le Pontique." *La Vie Spirituelle* supplément 59: 485–503.
- Riché, Pierre. 1962. *Éducation et culture dans l'Occident barbare VI^e–VIII^e siècle*. 4th ed. Sine loco: Éditions du Seuil.
- Röckelein, Hedwig. 1997. Zur Pragmatik hagiographischer Schriften im Frühmittelalter. In *Bene vivere in communitate. Beiträge zum italienischen und deutschen Mittelalter. Hagen Keller zum 60. Geburtstag überreicht von seinen Schülerinnen und Schülern*, ed. Thomas Scharff and Thomas Behrmann, 225–238. Münster: Waxmann.
- Rollason, David. 1989. *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rosenwein, Barbara. 2001. Writing without Fear about Early Medieval Emotions. *Early Medieval Europe* 10: 229–234.
- . 2002. Writing and Emotions in Gregory of Tours. In *Vom Nutzen des Schreibens. Soziales Gedächtnis, Herrschaft und Besitz im Mittelalter*, ed. Walter Pohl and Paul Herold, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 206, 23–32. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- . 2003. Even the Devil (Sometimes) Has Feelings: Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages. *The Haskins Society Journal* 14: 1–14.
- . 2003. Pouvoir et passion. Communautés émotionnelles en France au VII^e siècle. *Annales-Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 58: 1271–1292.
- . 2003. The Places and Spaces of Emotion. In *Uomo e spazio nell'alto medioevo, 4–8 aprile 2002, Settimane di Studio sull'Alto Medioevo*, 505–532. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo.
- . 2004. Identity and Emotions in the Early Middle Ages. In *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen. Von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, ed. Walter Pohl, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 322, 129–137. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- . 2006. *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Rousselle, Aline. 1974. Abstinence et continence dans le monastères du Gaule méridionale à la fin de l'antiquité et au début du moyen age. Etude d'un régime alimentaire et de sa fonction. In *Hommage a André Dupont (1987–1972). Études médiévales languedociennes offertes en hommage par ses anciens collègues, élèves et amis*, 239–254. Montpellier: Fédération historique du Languedoc méditerranéen et du Roussillon.
- Scharer, Anton. 1999. The Gregorian Tradition in Early England. In *St. Augustine and the Conversion of England*, ed. Richard Gameson. Phoenix Mill: Sutton Publishing: 187–201.
- Schmitt, Jean-Claude. 1994. *Les revenants. Les vivants et les morts dans la société médiévale*. Sine loco: Gallimard.

- Seeburger, Francis F. 1995. Humility, Maturity, and the Fear of God: Reflections on RB 7. *American Benedictine Review* 46: 149–168.
- Sorrell, R. D. 1978. *Dreams and Divination in Certain Writings of Gregory the Great*. B.Litt. Thesis, Oxford University.
- Stancilffe, Clare. 1983. *St. Martin and His Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stewart, Columba. 2001. Imageless Prayer and the Theological Vision of Evagrius Ponticus. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9: 186–191.
- Straw, Carole. 1988. *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1995. Purity and Death. In *Gregory the Great: A Symposium*, ed. John C. Cavadini, 16–37. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Stroumsa, Guy G. 1999. Dreams and Visions in Early Christian Discourse. In *Dream Cultures: Explorations in the Comparative History of Dreaming*, ed. David Schulman and Guy G. Stroumsa, 189–212. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Switek, Günter. 1972. 'Discretio spirituum.' Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Spiritualität. *Theologie und Philosophie* 47: 36–76.
- Thacker, Alan. 1992. Monks, Preaching and Pastoral Care in Early Anglo-Saxon England. In *Pastoral Care Before the Parish*, ed. John Blair and Richard Sharpe, 137–170. London: Leicester University Press.
- . 2002. The Making of a Local Saint. In *Local Saints and Local Cults in The Early Medieval West*, ed. Alan Thacker and Richard Sharpe, 45–73. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dam, Raymond. 1985. *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1993. *Saints and Their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Uytfanghe, Marc van. 1985. L'hagiographie et son public à l'époque mérovingienne. In *Papers presented to the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1975*, Part 2, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone, *Studia Patristica* 16, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altkristlichen Literatur 129, 54–62. Berlin.
- . 1987. *Stylisation biblique et condition humaine dans l'hagiographie mérovingienne*. Verhandlungen van de Koninklijke academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, klasse der letteren, jaargang 49, no. 120. Brussels: AWLSK.
- Waszink, J. H. 1941. Die sogenannte Fünfteilung der Träume bei Chalcidius und ihre Quellen. *Mnemosyne* 3rd series 9: 65–85.
- Wieland, Gernot. 1997. *Aures Lectoris: Orality and Literacy in Felix's Vita Sancti Guthlaci*. *Journal of Medieval Latin* 7: 168–177.
- Wolpers, Theodor. 1964. *Die englische Heiligenlegende des Mittelalters. Eine Formgeschichte des Legendenerzählens von der spätantiken lateinischen Tradition bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Buchreihe der Anglia 10. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Wood, Ian. 1982. The *Vita Columbani* and Merovingian Hagiography. *Peritia* 1: 63–80.
- . 2001. Topographies of Holy Power in Sixth-Century Gaul. In *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Mayke de Jong and Frans Theuvs with Carine van Rhijn, The Transformation of the Roman World 6, 137–154. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2002. Constructing Cults in Early Medieval France: Local Saints and Churches in Burgundy and the Auvergne 400–1000. In *Local Saints and Local Cults in The Early Medieval West*, 155–187. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wormald, Patrick. 2006. The Venerable Bede and the 'Church of the English.' In *The English Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism: Studies in Commemoration of the Second Centenary of John Keble*, 13–21. Wantage: Ikon Productions. Repr. in Patrick Wormald. 2006. *The Times of Bede: Studies in Early English Christian Society and its Historian*, ed. Stephen Baxter, 207–228. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

THE KIRKDALE DEDICATION INSCRIPTION AND ITS LATIN MODELS: ROMANITAS IN LATE ANGLO-SAXON YORKSHIRE

John Blair
The Queen's College, Oxford

Identifying Latin models for the Old English texts of Northumbria is an area to which Matti Kilpiö has made an important (and still insufficiently noticed) contribution.¹ The subject of the present note is briefer, later and humbler than that of Matti's work, the crucifixion poem on the Ruthwell Cross. It is nonetheless of some interest as a glimpse of intellectual cross-currents, and of contacts between episcopal high culture and the architectural patronage of Yorkshire gentry, in the generation before the Norman Conquest.

The parish church of Kirkdale, in the Vale of Pickering, is now a relatively simple building of various dates from the eleventh century onwards, in a rural setting. Some significant pre-Viking sculpture, and recent archaeological investigations by Philip Rahtz and Lorna Watts, indicate that through the eighth and ninth centuries it must have been a minster of wealth and status.² Thereafter, like most such places, it fell on hard times; the story of its revival is told by a remarkable inscription, and by some equally remarkable architectural features.

The dedication inscription (Fig. 1), now set over the south doorway in what may or may not be its original location, is carved on one side of a re-used stone coffin.³ This long, narrow shape, combined with the length of the text and the decision to incorporate a sundial, has dictated

¹ Matti Kilpiö, "Hrabanus' *De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis* and *The Dream of the Rood*," in *Neophilologica Fennica*, ed. Leena Kahlas-Tarkka (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 1987), 177–191.

² Philip A. Rahtz and Lorna Watts, "Three Ages of Conversion at Kirkdale, North Yorkshire," in *The Cross Goes North*, ed. Martin Carver (York: York Medieval Press, 2003), 289–309.

³ Elisabeth Okasha, *Hand-list of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), no. 64; Lorna Watts, Philip Rahtz, Elisabeth Okasha, S. A. J. Bradley, and John Higgitt, "Kirkdale—The Inscriptions," *Medieval Archaeology* 41 (1997): 51–99; John Higgitt, *Odda, Orm and Others: Patrons and Inscriptions in Later Anglo-Saxon England*, The Deerhurst Lecture 1999 (Deerhurst: Friends of Deerhurst Church, 2004), 7–9.

almost inevitably a layout comprising two rectangular panels set on either side of the sundial. The main text runs continuously from one panel to the other, with subsidiary texts below the dial and on its face:

+ Orm Gamal suna bohte S(an)c(tu)s Gregorius minster ðonne hit wes
 æl tobrocen 7 tofalan, 7 he hit let macan newan from grunde Criste 7
 S(anctus) Gregorius, in Eadward dagum c(y)n(in)g 7 [i]n Tosti dagum eorl +
 + 7 Hawarð me wrohte 7 Brand pr(e)s(byter)
 + þis is dæges solmerca + æt ilcum ti[d]e +

[+ Orm Gamalsson bought Saint Gregory's minster when it was completely broken and fallen down, and he had it made new from the ground for Christ and Saint Gregory,⁴ in the days of Edward the king and the days of Tostig the earl (i.e., between 1055 and 1065). +

+ And Hawarð made me, and Brand the priest.

+ This is the day's sun-marker + at each hour. +].

Although several other Anglo-Saxon dedication-inscriptions survive,⁵ this text is unique in its formulation, and has always been regarded as an elaborate anomaly. The possibility that it might have models lying



Figure 1. Above: Kirkdale: Orm Gamalsson's inscription (photo by John Blair). Below: York: Julia Fortunata's coffin (*Roman Inscriptions of Britain* 1:231: reproduced by permission of the Administrators of the Haverfield Bequest.)

⁴ Notwithstanding the nominative *Gregorius*, this is surely correct: the English names are likewise uninflected.

⁵ See John Higgitt, "The Dedication Inscription at Jarrow and its Context," *Antiquaries Journal* 59 (1979): 343–374; Higgitt, *Odda, Orm and Others*.

behind it occurred to me when, in the “Constantine the Great” exhibition held at York in 2006, I noticed an inscription of ca. AD 300 from the Roman fort of Birdoswald, Cumbria:

Dominis nostris [*names*] invictissimis Augustis et [*names*] nobilissimis Caesaribus, sub viro perfectissimo Aurelio Arpagio praeside, praetorium quod erat humo copertum et in labem conlapsum, et principia et balneum, restituit, curante Flavio Martino centurione praeposito, cohors...⁶

[To our lords (*names*) unconquered Augusti and (*names*) most noble Caesars, under His Perfection Aurelius Arpagius the governor, the... Cohort restored the commandant's house which had been covered with earth and had fallen into ruin, and the headquarters building and the bath-house, under the charge of Flavius Martinus, centurion in command.]

The Birdoswald slab was subsequently re-used as flooring in a barrack-block, and could not have been visible in the eleventh century. It represents, however, a type of inscription that was commonly used in Roman Britain, and that in its fullest form recorded the rebuilding—by named individuals, in honour of higher powers, and during the tenure of named officials—of structures which had fallen in ruins to the ground. Consider two more examples, the first from Great Chesters and the second from Lancaster:⁷

Imperator Caesar [*name*] Augustus, horreum vetustate conlabsum militibus cohortis II Asturum...a solo restituerunt, provinciam regente... Maximo legato Augusti propraetore, curante Valerio Martiale centurione legionis..., Fusco II et Dextro consulibus.

[The emperor (*name*) Augustus, for the soldiers of the Second Cohort of Asturians..., restored from ground-level this granary fallen through age, while the province was governed by... Maximus, emperor's propraetorian legate, under the charge of Valerius Martialis, centurion of the... Legion, in the consulship of Fuscus for the second time and Dexter.]

⁶ Elizabeth Hartley, Jane Hawkes, Martin Henig and Frances Mee, eds., *Constantine the Great: York's Roman Emperor* (York: York Museums and Galleries Trust, 2006), 117; R. G. Collingwood and R. P. Wright, *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain: 1: Inscriptions on Stone* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), no. 1912. Hereafter texts in *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain* are cited by number, in the form RIB 1912: irrelevant phrases, and emperors' names and titles, are omitted, and editorial reconstructions are not signalled. I would like to thank Roger Tomlin for his advice on this material, and Matthew Nicholls for suggesting other parallels.

⁷ RIB 1738, 605.

...ob balineum reffectum et basilicam vetustate conlabsum a solo restitutam, equitibus alae Sebussianae..., curante Flavio Ammausio praefecto equitum; dedicata ante diem XI Kalendas Septembres, Censore II et Lepido II consulibus.

[...on account of the bath-house rebuilt and the basilica, which had fallen through age, restored from ground-level, for the troopers of the Sebosian Cavalry Regiment...under the charge of Flavius Ammausius, prefect of cavalry; dedicated on 22 August in the consulship of Censor and Lepidus, both for the second time.]

Edited in *The Inscriptions of Roman Britain* are ten versions of the formulae *vetustate dilapsam/conlapsam/corruptam restituit/restituerunt*,⁸ ten of the formulae *a solo fecit/restituit*,⁹ and nine more with variants on these themes including rebuildings after fires.¹⁰ When reasonably complete, these are generally combined with common-form features such as invocation of emperors and dating by consular year. Among surviving late Anglo-Saxon inscriptions, by contrast, the Kirkdale text is unique both in dating by king and earl, and in describing a rebuilding from the ground. It is therefore not difficult to guess that lying behind this Old English text is a now-lost Latin one which had survived from Roman Britain, and which read something like: *Imperatori Caesari* [name] *basilicam, conlapsam in ruinam*, [name of regiment] *a solo restituit*, [name] *et* [name] *consulibus*.

Where might Orm Gamalsson have come across such an inscription? The obvious possibility is York, twenty miles from Kirkdale and the location of three of the inscriptions already mentioned.¹¹ One other fact pointing in that direction is that stone coffins with inscriptions on their long faces, not otherwise common in Roman Britain, seem to have been especially popular in York (Fig. 1).¹² It could have been the sight of one of these coffins that suggested to Orm or his advisors the idea of re-using a stone coffin at Kirkdale. Although the three-part layout cannot be exactly paralleled, the general aspect of the Kirkdale inscription, with its formal fielded panels, looks decidedly Roman. It does not seem unreasonable to perceive this as deliberate imitation: a piece of late Anglo-Saxon classicism.

⁸ *RIB* 333, 430, 605, 927, 979, 1234, 1242, 1738, 1912, 1988.

⁹ *RIB* 179, 334, 587, 605, 658, 721, 978, 1281, 1334, 1738.

¹⁰ *RIB* 152, 455, 462, 648, 656, 730, 791, 919, 1092.

¹¹ *RIB* 648, 656, 658.

¹² *RIB* 670, 674, 677, 687.

It is therefore very interesting that Kirkdale church has some claim to be the earliest mature Romanesque building still standing in England: the nook-shafts of the chancel arch and west doorway, and the cushion capitals and radial voussoirs of the latter, are unmistakable if slightly archaic-looking products of the Norman Romanesque.¹³ In an English church of this status one would be inclined—but for the inscription—to date them closer to 1090 than to 1060, though the tall, narrow proportions of the doorway do look more Anglo-Saxon than Norman. The reference to a total rebuilding around 1060 has, however, encouraged the suggestion that this may be one of the few exceptions to the general English resistance, through the reigns of Cnut and Edward the Confessor, to architectural influence from the Continent. Basic problems unfortunately remain: is the standing nave dated by the inscription, and are the arch and doorway primary features within it? Nonetheless, the recognition of deliberate *Romanitas* in Orm's inscription might tend to strengthen the likelihood that the church which he built had its own pretensions to up-to-date classical reference.

Orm Gamalsson was a Yorkshire thegn of substantial but not pre-eminent rank.¹⁴ Such a man would probably have been literate in his own language, but scarcely in Latin, and it seems improbable that he would have been in direct contact with the latest currents in Continental architectural fashion. We should look for an intermediary, and a plausible one suggests himself in the person of Ealdred, Archbishop of York 1061–1069.¹⁵ Ealdred was one of the most cosmopolitan figures of late Anglo-Saxon England, whose travels took him at various times to Cologne, Rome, Hungary and Jerusalem. He was also a

¹³ H. M. Taylor and Joan Taylor, *Anglo-Saxon Architecture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 1:357–361; Eric Fernie, *The Architecture of the Anglo-Saxons* (London: Batsford, 1983), 159–160; Richard K. Morris, "Churches in York and its Hinterland: Building Patterns and Stone Sources in the 11th and 12th Centuries," in *Minsters and Parish Churches*, ed. John Blair (Oxford: Oxford Committee for Archaeology, 1988), 191–199, at 196.

¹⁴ Despite the reservations of Gillian Fellows-Jensen, "Of Danes—and Thaness—and Domesday Book," in *People and Places in Northern Europe*, ed. I. Wood and N. Lund (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1991), 107–121, at 111, it does seem highly likely that the man in the inscription is identical with the Orm who in 1066 held scattered lands in the area up to a yearly value of nearly fifty pounds, including the important manor of Kirbymoorside: *The Victoria History of the County of York*, ed. William Page, Victoria County History, 3 vols. (London: Constable, 1907–1913), 2:277.

¹⁵ M. K. Lawson and V. King, "Ealdred," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* 17 (2004): 552–554, provides a thorough account of his life, with references.

notable builder and artistic patron, whose reconstructions and embellishments of the churches at York, Beverley and Southwell were long remembered. In the present context it is striking that the only other elaborate dedication text surviving from late Anglo-Saxon England is directly associated with Ealdred, in his previous career as Bishop of Worcester: the panel which records his dedication of Odda's chapel at Deerhurst (Glos.) on 12 April 1056, a date also expressed there as the fourteenth regnal year of King Edward.¹⁶ John Higgitt has noted the "unusually sophisticated" character of this panel and its "remarkably classical-looking" lettering, and has suggested that Ealdred may have been the conduit for the Continental influences informing it.¹⁷

The most likely explanation for a precocious Romanesque church at Kirkdale is surely that it was modelled on, and perhaps built by the same masons as, some larger project of Ealdred's. If so, we can readily suppose that it was Ealdred, or a cleric in his entourage (conceivably "Brand the priest" of the inscription?), who drew Orm's attention to an appropriately dignified Latin model for celebrating the rebirth of an important building, and who transposed it for him both into a Christian context and into the English language.

¹⁶ Okasha, *Handlist*, no. 28; Higgitt, *Odda, Orm and Others*, 2–7.

¹⁷ Higgitt, *Odda, Orm and Others*, 6–7.

Works Cited

- Collingwood, R. G., and R. P. Wright. 1965. *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain: 1: Inscriptions on Stone*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fellows-Jensen, Gillian. 1991. Of Danes—and Thanes—and Domesday Book. In *People and Places in Northern Europe*, ed. Ian Wood and Niels Lund, 107–121. Woodbridge: Boydell.
- Fernie, Eric. 1983. *The Architecture of the Anglo-Saxons*. London: Batsford.
- Hartley, Elizabeth, Jane Hawkes, Martin Henig, and Frances Mee, eds. 2006. *Constantine the Great: York's Roman Emperor*. York: York Museums and Galleries Trust.
- Higgitt, John. 1979. The Dedication Inscription at Jarrow and its Context. *Antiquaries Journal* 59: 343–374.
- . 2004. *Odda, Orm and Others: Patrons and Inscriptions in Later Anglo-Saxon England*. The Deerhurst Lecture 1999. Deerhurst: Friends of Deerhurst Church.
- Kilpiö, Matti. 1987. Hrabanus' *De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis* and *The Dream of the Rood*. In *Neophilologica Fennica*, ed. Leena Kahlas-Tarkka, 177–191. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Lawson, M. K., and V. King. 2004. Ealdred. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* 17: 552–554.
- Morris, Richard K. 1988. Churches in York and its Hinterland: Building Patterns and Stone Sources in the 11th and 12th Centuries. In *Minsters and Parish Churches*, ed. John Blair, 191–199. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.
- Okasha, Elizabeth. 1971. *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Page, William, ed. 1907–1913. *The Victoria History of the County of York*. Victoria County History. London: Constable.
- Rahtz, Philip A., and Lorna Watts. 2003. Three Ages of Conversion at Kirkdale, North Yorkshire. In *The Cross Goes North*, ed. Martin Carver, 289–309. York: York Medieval Press.
- Taylor, H. M. and Joan Taylor. 1965. *Anglo-Saxon Architecture Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watts, Lorna, Philip Rahtz, Elisabeth Okasha, S. A. J. Bradley, and John Higgitt. 1997. Kirkdale—The Inscriptions. *Medieval Archaeology* 41: 51–99.

LINGUISTIC GEOGRAPHY, DEMOGRAPHY, AND MONASTIC COMMUNITY: SCRIBAL LANGUAGE AT BURY ST EDMUNDS

Kathryn A. Lowe
University of Glasgow

Introduction

In their preface to an edited collection of articles on East Anglian English, Jacek Fisiak and Peter Trudgill note that “the English of this area has a very special place indeed in the history of the language.”¹ As they observe, not only did East Anglia constitute one of the first areas of settlement by the West Germanic tribes bound for Britain in the fifth century, but the language of its substantial population in the later medieval period also significantly shaped the development of Standard English. Despite the importance of this variety, however, key questions about its development and nature remain unanswered as a result of the nature of the evidence and the decidedly uneven spread of its textual remains: we know a good deal about the language of East Anglia in the later period but very little indeed about its pre-Conquest characteristics. Within Suffolk, however, one place offers continuity of evidence for its dialect from the late Old English through the late medieval period: the English written and copied at the Benedictine

¹ *East Anglian English*, ed. Jacek Fisiak and Peter Trudgill (Cambridge: Brewer, 2001), x. What the term “East Anglia” in this context actually constitutes is, as Fisiak and Trudgill observe, not an easy issue to resolve. For valid objections to the phrase itself and to what he calls a “traditional preoccupation” with dialect boundaries, see Michael Benskin’s article “Descriptions of dialect and areal distributions,” in *Speaking in Our Tongues: Proceedings of a Colloquium of Medieval Dialectology and Related Disciplines*, ed. Margaret Laing and Keith Williamson (Cambridge: Brewer, 1994), 169–187, at 169–73. Here I use the term narrowly as shorthand for Norfolk and Suffolk. For an historical justification of this approach and the close-knit nature of the two shires, see David C. Douglas, *The Social Structure of Medieval East Anglia*, Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History 9 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927), 2–3. A fresh, and very interesting, view on the region is given by Tom Williamson, *England’s Landscape: East Anglia* (London: Collins, 2006), 28–29, who stresses the cultural and geographical similarities between north-east Suffolk and Norfolk on the one hand, and south-west Suffolk and Essex on the other. In such an account, Bury is seen very much as liminal.

abbey of Bury St Edmunds. In this article, I describe and assess the material surviving from the Abbey during the Old English period in respect of one particular sound change. I move on to outline what are generally considered to be the diagnostic dialectal differences between Norfolk and Suffolk in the later period. The evidence supplied by the post-Conquest material from Bury appears to show a blurring of these distinctions: I consider a range of potential explanations for this, and conclude that they are to be found in the demographic make-up of the Abbey's community.

Old East Anglian

Those who work in the field of Old English dialectology will be painfully aware of the methodological problems associated with its study. Not only are texts of any sort outside the West Saxon area thin on the ground, but the opportunity for directly comparative work is virtually eliminated given the chronologically patchy nature of survival. The situation was succinctly summed up by Crowley in 1986:

there is no evidence for Northumbrian of the ninth century and the early tenth; for Mercian before c.750, or of the later two thirds of the eleventh century; for Kentish before c.800 and after c.1000; and for West Saxon before c.850. Relatively few witnesses date before 950. Those that do are quite important, because texts after 950 are usually affected by the standard Late West Saxon literary language.²

The situation is even worse for East Anglian. Three of the seven kingdoms that made up the heptarchy are absent from the conventional dialect groupings of Anglo-Saxon England. While the fortunes of Essex, Sussex and East Anglia all fluctuated during the period of the heptarchy (conveniently, 500–800), the East Anglian dynasty seems alone of the three to have retained a consistent degree of independence. There is therefore no sound historical reason for its exclusion, but rather a pragmatic one: what is considered to be an almost complete lack of evidence for the status of the dialect during the Anglo-Saxon period.

² Joseph P. Crowley, "The Study of Old English Dialects," *English Studies* 67 (1986): 97–112, at 103.

There is, however, quite a body of pre-Conquest charter material surviving from the archive of the Benedictine foundation of Bury St Edmunds which is of potential value, but no scholar seems to have taken full account of it. In an important article, Jacek Fisiak summarised the available evidence for Old English dialectology in general and East Anglia in particular, suggesting that onomastics (in the form of place-names and personal names on coins and in the Domesday Book) plus, in his phrase, “possibly... a very limited number of documents” might throw some light on dialectology in the eleventh century.³ However, his careful study of the reflex of the *i*-mutation of /u/ in stressed syllables focuses exclusively on names in Domesday Book and later sources.⁴ Fisiak is in fact one of the few scholars who even acknowledge the existence of early charter material in this area: for Gillis Kristensson, “many parts of England, for instance East Anglia, are not represented by any texts at all.”⁵ Some of this reluctance to admit charter material may result from the standardisation problem, but careful analysis should allow us to make certain deductions about the language of East Anglia in late Anglo-Saxon England even when viewed through the filter of partial standardisation, just as it is considered possible to retrieve local forms from the filter of Norman scribes in the Domesday and Little Domesday Books (henceforth DB, LDB).

Fisiak shows through certain test words in DB and LDB together with retrodictive evidence supplied by Middle English names and dialect surveys that Old English /y/ > /e/, a phenomenon confined by the

³ Jacek Fisiak, “Old English Anglian: A Problem in Old English Dialectology,” *AUMLA Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association* 70 (1988): 336–365, reprinted in *East Anglian English*, ed. Fisiak and Trudgill, 13–38, at 25.

⁴ On DB specifically, see Jacek Fisiak, “*Domesday Book* and Late Old English Dialects,” in *Historical Linguistics 1987*, ed. Henning Andersen and Konrad Koerner, *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 66 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990), 107–128.

⁵ “The Old English Anglian/Saxon Boundary Revisited,” in *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*, ed. Jacek Fisiak, *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs* 103 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997), 271–281, at 272. Compare his more careful statement of two years previously, “a dialect like East Anglian, for instance, is not represented by any literary texts at all” (Gillis Kristensson, “Languages in Contact: Old East Saxon and East Anglian,” in *East Anglian English*, ed. Fisiak and Trudgill, 63–70, at 63, reprinted from *Studies in Anglistics*, ed. Gunnel Melchers and Beatrice Warren (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1995), 259–268). Fisiak’s own formulation is more judiciously worded: “there are few or no dialectally significant charters for the areas of England not represented by literary records, e.g. East Anglia” (“Old East Anglian,” 23).

standard accounts of Richard Hogg to Kent, and Alistair Campbell to Kent and Surrey, may in fact be extended to Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire, Hertford, Bedford and northern Northamptonshire with occasional forms elsewhere. This change is one of a set of developments amounting to, in John Anderson's words, the "elimination... of the distinctiveness of the majority of the front monophthongs, long and short" in Kentish,⁶ that are generally treated as disparate in standard grammars (or together only insofar as they are considered to be largely restricted to the Kentish dialect). Anderson, however, argued from a dependency phonology perspective that these changes, in which /e(:)/ substitutes for the original vowels, may be regarded as unitary.⁷ These modifications, which are discussed below, may be summarised as (1) the reflex of Germanic /a:/, ($\bar{a}^1$), appears as /e:/, not /æ:/;⁸ (2) *i*-mutation of /ai/, ($\bar{a}^2$), appears as /e:/, not /æ:/; (3) first fronting of Germanic */a/ appears as /e/, not /æ/ (Hogg §5.10); (4) restoration of */α/, *i*-mutated, appears as /e/, not /æ/; (5) *i*-mutation of /u:/ appears as /e:/ not /y:/; (6) *i*-mutation of /u/ appears as /e/ not /y/.⁹

Unfortunately, the regular developments of /æ(:)/ after the Conquest mean that retrodictive evidence of the kind used by Fisiak cannot be used to ascertain whether these features also extended to Suffolk during the pre-Conquest period.¹⁰ It is also noteworthy that Fisiak's findings are not referenced or discussed by Hogg, even though his article was published some four years before *A Grammar of Old English*.¹¹ Such an omission may stem from reluctance to accept this kind of material.

⁶ John Anderson, "The Great Kentish Collapse," in *Luick Revisited*, ed. Dieter Kastovsky and Gero Bauer, Tübingen Beiträge zur Linguistik 288 (Tübingen: Gunter Narr), 97–107.

⁷ See also Richard M. Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English. Volume 1: Phonology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), §5.188.

⁸ See note below 16 below.

⁹ Anderson also considers the *i*-mutation of /o(:)/, but unrounding to /e/ is thought to have been pretty much complete in West Saxon and Kentish by the time of the earliest texts (Hogg, *Grammar*, §5.77), and so is not at issue here.

¹⁰ Richard Jordan (*Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology*, trans. and rev. Eugene J. Crook, Janua Linguarum Series Practica 218 (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), §32) notes the "Normanized" spelling of <e> besides <æ> and <a> alongside <e> in West Midlands and Kent for æ. <e> and <æ> spellings co-exist for $\bar{a}^1$ (Jordan, *Middle English Grammar*, §49) and $\bar{a}^2$ (Jordan, *Middle English Grammar*, §48).

¹¹ As Fisiak notes ("Old East Anglian," 26), Luick had shown on the basis of Middle English place-name evidence that the shift extended to parts of Sussex, Middlesex, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire, but no mention of this is made by either Hogg or Campbell.

It becomes more important, therefore, that we take full account of the charter evidence from the period, and to this end I list the material surviving from Bury.

Anglo-Saxon charter material from Bury

Nine single-sheet charters survive from the foundation which date (or purport to date) from the Anglo-Saxon period.¹² Five of these are royal and thus produced centrally:¹³ one diploma (S 703, with a boundary clause in English), two grants of privilege (S 995 in Latin, S 980 in Latin and English versions), and two vernacular writs (S 1071, S 1084). However, there are also four vernacular single-sheet charters that are likely to be local compositions. All date to the tenth and eleventh centuries: a grant by one Thurketel of land at Suffolk to the foundation (S 1225, ca. 1040), the will of bishop Ælfric (S 1489, 1023 × 1038), and the wills of Ælflæd (S 1494, 962 × 991) and her sister Æthelflæd (S 1486, 1000 × 1002) copied together onto a single sheet of membrane. Together these texts amount to around 1,450 words, although the Ælflæd/Æthelflæd copy accounts for over 1,000 of these. Also of interest is a series of nine vernacular memoranda dating from the mid-eleventh to the first half of the twelfth century copied into a bilingual rule of St Benedict (Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS 197) which I have dealt with elsewhere.¹⁴

For each charter, the tables in the Appendix give the number of spellings in <e>, alongside the expected standard spelling, for each of the six categories of etymological vowels listed above. This count includes words or word-elements with reduced stress such as prepositions and the second elements of personal and place-names. Separate

¹² Charters are here referred to by their Sawyer number (Peter H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*, Royal Historical Guides and Handbooks 8 (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1968); revised edition online at <<http://www.esawyer.org.uk>>).

¹³ For a summary of the debate over the local involvement with boundary clause production, see my "The Development of the Anglo-Saxon Boundary Clause," *Nomina* 21 (1998): 63–100.

¹⁴ A. J. Robertson, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Studies in English Legal History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), no. 104. I have looked in some detail at these interesting texts and their language in my article, "Post-Conquest Bilingual Composition in Memoranda from Bury St Edmunds," *Review of English Studies* 58 (2007): 52–66.

tables give the number of back spellings for each charter. The tables are accompanied by a full list of tokens, where discussion of problematic forms may also be found. The boundary clause to S 1486 is treated separately. $\bar{a}^1$ of course presents a particular difficulty, as it was raised to /e:/ in Anglian in prehistoric Old English, and some have assumed that the development is generally non-West Saxon.¹⁵ However, I believe with Hogg that it remained /æ/ in Kentish before being raised as part of the developments under consideration.¹⁶ I therefore assume that East Anglian was originally an /æ:/ dialect as well, but as $\bar{a}^1$ and $\bar{a}^2$ reflexes are treated separately in what follows, it is easy to discount these forms.

Discussion

It is important to read the summary tables in the Appendix in conjunction with the full list of forms, because some figures are undoubtedly skewed by the frequent use of individual lexical items, and some scribes seem to have exercised a marked preference for the spelling of these words. For example, all eleven instances of <e> for the reflex of the first fronting of /a/ in S 1489 are of reduced-stress *æt*. Conversely, the ninety-six tokens of the <æ> spelling of the same reflex in S 1486 and S 1494 include fifty of *æt*, and the scribe spells the preposition with <e> on only two occasions. Noteworthy are the comparatively large numbers of inverse spellings which strongly suggest that scribes are attempting to comply with the late West Saxon standard and to distinguish between sounds that had fallen together in their own variety. As well as a run of <y> and <æ> spellings for /e/, there is one example of a thoroughly confused <æ> for <y> in the second element of the personal name *Ælþ' r' æðe* (< *ðrȳð*) and one of <y> for <æ> in *Ylig* (< *æ̅l*) (both in S 1486/94). The substantial majority of these inverse spellings appear in place- and personal-name elements which are likely to prove problematic even to well-trained scribes. As a whole, the evidence presented here suggests that the collapse of the front vowels to /e/ observed in the Kentish material had extended at

¹⁵ For example, Alistair Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon: 1959), §128.

¹⁶ Hogg, *Grammar*, §3.24 n. 1.

least as far as Bury, and that the full effects of these combined changes are masked by standardisation.

Unstressed syllables

In unstressed syllables, all texts show uncertainty as a result of the falling together of all the back vowels with the unstressed front vowel /e/ in /ə/. However, unparalleled elsewhere is the endemic use in the main text of S 1486/94 of <æ> for <e> in unstressed syllables and in the first element of diphthongs.¹⁷ This is best illustrated by an extract:

7 ic `ge'an þæs landes æt fingringahó bæorhtnoðe ældermen 7 mire spuster hiræ deg 7 ofer hire dæg into sæ pætres cyrcan æt myresigæ. 7 ic gæan þæs landes æt polstede bæorhtnoðe ældormæn. 7 mire spuster hire deg. 7 ofor hira dæg into stocy. 7 ic gæan þæs landæs æt hpifersce into stocy ofer minnæ deg 7 ic gæan bæorhtnoðæ ældermen. 7 mire spuster þæs landes æt strætforda hire dæg. 7 ofer hire dæg. Ic his gæan into stocy. 7 ic pillæ þ lauham ga into stoce ofær þes æaldermannes dæg. 7 mire spuster. 7 ic gean þæs landes æt byligesdynæ into stocy ofer þæs æaldermanes dæg.

In the text as a whole, <eo> appears roughly equally with <æo>, but <æa> appears about twice as often as does <ea>. The scribe's difficulties with the latter are surely exacerbated by the pronunciation of the latter as /æɑ/ coupled with the effects of its undergoing monophthongization to /æ/.¹⁸ This suggests that something more than (or, as well as) graphic substitution is at play here, but simple substitution must account for forms with <æ> in unstressed positions, given that unstressed -e must have been pronounced /ə/ by this stage.¹⁹ With final -e, the correct form predominates over the incorrect one by about 2.5:1. With -es the hit rate is better, with correct spellings outnumbering <æs> forms by over 4:1. The back spelling of <y> for <e> also

¹⁷ In the boundary clause to S 1486 I note *Acyntune* (Acton Sf < pers name *Aca*, also spelled *Acantune*), with <y> presumably for the reduced *schwa* vowel. *Rigindune* (Reydon Sf < *ryge*, "rye," also spelled *Rigendune*) may be the same, with unrounded vowel.

¹⁸ I note two examples in this text: *Ædmundes* and *Læxadyne*. There are rather more examples in S 1489: *Ædwine*, *Ælffæh*, *æstan*, *dæcane* (< *dēacon*; see Campbell, *Grammar*, §546), *ofaræcan*, *sæmestre*, "seamstress".

¹⁹ Hogg, *Grammar*, §6.62.

appears in place-names, in the dative *Stocy* ($\times 5$, *recte* $\times 2$) and once in *Bucyshealæ*.²⁰

The forms displayed in the copies of S 1486, S 1494 and the completely different picture presented by the boundary clause to S 1486 require some contextualisation. The scribe of the bounds seems to have had far less trouble than the main text scribe in reproducing standard orthography; his few slips are largely restricted to place-name elements, and all are inverse spellings. *Ælflæd*'s is the only surviving will to have an appended boundary clause, and it seems likely that the text of the bounds was extracted from diplomas relating to the three estates (Balsdon, Withermarsh and Polstead) covered in them. If this is the case, then the fact that the language appears to differ from the language of the rest of the single sheet and of the others discussed here is unsurprising. By this date, boundary surveys, originally produced locally, would have been incorporated into the diploma by the main text scribe as part of some type of centralised production. The language of such clauses is unlikely, therefore, to display many indigenously dialect features (other, of course, than lexis).²¹

Bury is by no means the only monastic (or even the major) beneficiary of either *Æthelflæd*'s or *Ælflæd*'s will and therefore the single sheet need not have originated there. Whitelock argues that the endorsement, which rehearses the names of the two estates left to Bury, shows that it was a Bury charter.²² However, it really only demonstrates that the single sheet had fetched up at Bury by the twelfth century when, according to Thomson, the endorsement was probably written.²³ The fact that the three estates covered in the boundary surveys were not bequeathed to Bury but instead to a foundation at Stoke

²⁰ Dorothy Whitelock's rather desperate suggestion that the forms with <y> might be a dialectal survival of a locative must be wrong; see *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, Cambridge Studies in English Legal History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930): 140.

²¹ This view is substantiated by two forms (inter alia) in the bounds of *Cæresige* (Kersey Sf), where the second element is derived from West Saxon *īeg*, "island," the *i*-mutated form of /*α*/ (non West Saxon /*e*/) (Hogg, *Grammar*, §5.82). The thirteenth-century copyist of Cambridge, University Library Ff. 2. 33 spells the form *Kereseye*. Cf. *Humelcyrre* (< West Saxon *cierr*, "turn") $\times 2$. This place-name has not been identified, and may similarly have been unknown to the thirteenth-century scribe who copies *Humekirre*, *Humelkirre*.

²² Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, 137.

²³ Rodney Thomson, *The Archives of the Abbey of Bury St Edmund*, Suffolk Records Society 21 (Cambridge: Boydell, 1980), 59, no. 110. Thomson indicates uncertainty about this dating. The <w> graph certainly suggests that it is post-Conquest.

strongly suggests either that the surviving single sheet originated from there or that it was copied from a text or texts produced at Stoke. That the boundary clauses are written in a different hand might imply the former, for there would be no reason why a Bury scribe would go to the trouble of adding material irrelevant to the interests of the foundation to the single sheet.²⁴ Stoke has been identified by Dorothy Whitelock as Stoke-by-Nayland, around twenty-three miles to the south of Bury and ten miles to the north of Colchester, just shy of the Essex border.²⁵ Despite its substantial endowment, no record of the foundation survives. By Domesday Book the estates bequeathed to Stoke by Æthelflæd, Ælflæd and Ælfgar, their father, were in various lay hands.

Both wills are copied by a single scribe on a single sheet of parchment. Æthelflæd's will (S 1494), datable to 962 × 991, must therefore be a copy; Ælflæd's will (S 1486) may or may not be a copy; the unparalleled layout of two wills on a single sheet of parchment and the fact that the wills appear to have been written on a single occasion suggests to me that the scribe worked from pre-existing texts.²⁶ There is no discernible, consistent difference between the language of the two wills. It is perhaps unsurprising that a scribe working at a foundation considerably less important than Bury and therefore less a centre of scribal production would have produced a text which is so orthographically wide of the mark. Nevertheless, its scribe is not unaware of the notion of the requirement to differentiate graphically between what must have been then largely indistinguishable sounds in his own dialect and that of his exemplars. Indeed, he appears to have worked largely on the rough (but often appropriate) rule of thumb that much of what he pronounced as /e/ or saw written as <e> should be copied with <æ>. Over-confident of this strategy, he appears to have extended this principle to the first element of diphthongs and final unstressed -e with less success.

²⁴ This was also the conclusion reached by Rebecca Rushforth, who further observed the lack of "close comparanda" with other Bury productions in terms of script ("The Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century Manuscripts of Bury St Edmunds Abbey" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2003) 38 and 81).

²⁵ Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, 105.

²⁶ Much of Æthelflæd's will leaves land to her sister and husband with reversion to a monastic beneficiary after their deaths, and Ælflæd's will refers to these arrangements. A copy of the two texts together was therefore useful.

Dialect differences between Norfolk and Suffolk

Although the evidence presented above strongly suggests that all the front monophthongs other than /i/ had fallen together as /e/ in Bury and further south in Suffolk, there is no comparable pre-Conquest material from Norfolk, so it is not possible to tell from the Old English evidence whether the developments discussed above extended to East Anglia as a whole. Here closely localisable, although restricted, retrodictive evidence supplied in the main by place- and personal-name elements remains of considerable value. Stig Carlsson noted what he called a “marked difference” between Norfolk and Suffolk in the spelling of Old English <y> in his study on local bynames in East Anglia.²⁷ His test words of *Brigge*, *Chirche*, *Hill*, *Hirne*, *Herst/Hurst*, *Mille*, and *Pit* revealed that Norfolk strongly favoured spellings in <i, y> pretty much to the exclusion of spellings in <e> or <u> (the latter, as Carlsson noted, generally found in the West Midland area). Suffolk presented a more mixed picture and one that appears to an extent lexically conditioned, but with a preponderance of <e> spellings (as one would expect given the picture supplied by the Old English evidence), with <i, y> a strong minority, and <u> once again very little represented. Other differences between the two dialects reported by Carlsson included <qw> spellings for Old English *hw* in Norfolk (Suffolk <wh>), which he describes as “a characteristic feature” from the fourteenth century.²⁸ He also noted the byname *Chirche* (and variants), common in both Norfolk and Suffolk, and the rare *Kirke* (< Old Norse *kirkja*), found only a couple of times in Carlsson’s material.²⁹ The earliest of Carlsson’s sources dates to 1121, the latest to 1332. The same features were observed by Gillis Kristensson, who commented “all these differences go back to Old English times, and it seems warranted to speak about *Northern East Anglian* and *Southern East Anglian*.”³⁰

It is certainly true that locals were aware of differences between the two dialects later in the Middle English period. In a famous passage in his *Chronicle*, begun in the mid 1190s, Jocelin describes his beloved abbot Samson, who was born in Tottington, Norfolk, just north of

²⁷ Stig Carlsson, *Studies on Middle English Local Bynames in East Anglia*, Lund Studies in English 79 (Lund: Lund University Press, 1989), 4.1.7 (pp. 160–162).

²⁸ Carlsson, *Local Bynames*, 161.

²⁹ Carlsson, *Local Bynames*, 32, 67.

³⁰ Kristensson, “Languages in Contact,” 67.

Thetford and about twenty-three miles from Bury.³¹ His dialect was considered worth remarking on by Jocelin whose surname, Brakelond, suggests that he was from Bury itself.³²

Homo erat eloquens, Gallice et Latine, magis rationi dicendorum quam ornatui uerborum innitens. Scripturam Anglice scriptam legere nouit elegantissime, et Anglice sermocinare solebat populo, set secundum linguam Norfolchie, ubi natus et nutritus erat

[He was eloquent both in French and Latin, having regard rather to the sense of what he had to say than to ornaments of speech. He read English perfectly, and used to preach in English to the people, but in the speech of Norfolk where he was born and bred].³³

The following sections examine to what extent these differences are reflected in the written materials from the abbey in the post-Conquest period, and considers the problems associated with copy practices and text type.

The post-Conquest cartularies from Bury St Edmunds

Bury St Edmunds is extremely unusual in the number of non-literary manuscripts surviving from the foundation, and the enthusiasm with which the foundation's monks copied and recopied the pre-Conquest material. In his guide to Bury's archives, Thomson identified some thirty-nine surviving record books.³⁴ Over half of these contain copies of pre-Conquest material, and their ranks are swelled by a series of official copies of Anglo-Saxon writs in Exchequer and Chancery Rolls. From this mass of material, two cartularies stand out as being particularly relevant here. They are Cambridge, University Library Ff. 2. 33 (henceforward F) and London, British Library Additional 14847 (henceforward A). The former, a register probably produced between 1280 and 1294,³⁵ contains copies of essentially the whole pre-Conquest archive. All the Anglo-Saxon material, copied by a single

³¹ Samson's life and career is treated in detail as part one of Antonia Gransden, *A History of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds 1182–1256* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 1–147.

³² See Gransden, *History*, 5.

³³ *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond*, ed. H. E. Butler (London: Nelson, 1949), 39, with translation, 40.

³⁴ Thomson, *Archives*, 3.

³⁵ The manuscript is described by Thomson, *Archives*, 148–149 (no. 1296).

scribe, is contained in two separate sequences, one of royal charters and writs, and one of private grants. This last category includes an important series of vernacular wills, including copies of those texts discussed above. A, known as the "Album Registrum" or "White Register" by the fifteenth century, is of similar date and includes the majority of texts found in F. Thomson notes that three scribes were responsible for the copies of the Anglo-Saxon material, one of whom produces the wills and private grants, one the royal grants, and one the sequence of writs in the manuscript.³⁶ Although there are certain differences between the hands of each of the stints, the variation may be explained by a switch in language or in the date of text being copied, and the similarities seem on balance to outweigh the differences. It is now my judgment that all the pre-Conquest material was copied by the same scribe, although in at least two tranches.³⁷ The texts in A are copied in the same order as F within each group.

I have considered the relationship between these two manuscripts fully elsewhere. Textual evidence reveals that the sequence of wills contained in A was copied directly from F.³⁸ It is unclear whether the writs and royal grants in A are also derived from F or were independently copied from the same exemplar.³⁹ F himself was certainly copying from the now-lost register of John of Northwold, abbot of the foundation between 1279 and 1301, which is referred to in many of the cartularies. I have reconstructed the contents of this register from these references, and believe that it presented *literatim* texts of the Anglo-Saxon wills contained within it written in semi-imitative script.⁴⁰ It seems likely that the language of the writs was already updated in the Northwold register.

The language of these two manuscripts has been considered before, by Angus McIntosh, although he was working with the theory that

³⁶ The manuscript is described by Thomson, *Archives*, 121–123 (no. 1278).

³⁷ This statement revises my earlier view expressed in (e.g.) "Two Thirteenth-Century Cartularies from Bury St Edmunds: A Study in Textual Transmission," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 93 (1992): 293–301.

³⁸ "Two Thirteenth-Century Cartularies" and, with some refinement of this argument, "Sawyer 1070: A Ghost Writ of King Edward the Confessor," *Notes and Queries* 50 (2003): 150–152.

³⁹ See Lowe, "Sawyer 1070".

⁴⁰ "The Anglo-Saxon Contents of a Lost Register from Bury St Edmunds," *Anglia* 121 (2003): 515–534.

F and A were copied independently from the Northwold Register in its entirety. He noted the following forms which he argued precluded a Bury origin for the Northwold manuscript:

1. *kirke*, *kyrke*, 'church,' and never *ch* forms.
2. *mikel*, 'much' (beside only one instance of *michel*).
3. *swilk(e)*, *suilk(e)*, *suilc*, *squilk(e)*, *svilke*, 'such,' and never *ch* forms.
4. *-et* beside *-eð*, *-eth* in the 3rd sg. pres. indicative.
5. *ilk(e)*, *alk(e)*, 'each,' and never *ch* forms.
6. *to* (beside *tueye* etc.), 'two.'
7. Regular *-like* for *-ly*.'
8. Forms of 'shall' with *s* (in A).
9. *get*, *giet* for 'yet' with *(i)e* rather than *i*, cf. *togedere* (rather than *togidere*).
10. *wilke* (in F, where A has *weche*) for "which."⁴¹

This remains an admirable summary of the evidence. Although not all forms appear in all of the different text types (*kirke*, for example, appears only in the wills), there are sufficient of these Norfolkisms across the wills, writs and royal grants to identify the scribes responsible for F and A as apparently hailing from north of the Suffolk border. At least two explanations are possible here: that the scribes are indeed from Norfolk; or that the forms exhibited in A do not represent that scribe's own dialect, but instead are part of his passive repertoire or are relict forms. If this is the case, only the scribe of F and that of the lost Northwold register (assuming that only one was responsible for its production) would need to be from that county.

McIntosh expressed some surprise that the scribe of the Northwold register was a Norfolk man, but links to that county can be traced back to the monastery's beginnings, and the importance of the foundation throughout the medieval period means that its community was likely to be drawn from a fairly wide area. The following sections of this article examine the evidence for the geographical origins of those associated with the monastery during the medieval period.

⁴¹ Angus McIntosh, "The Language of the Extant Versions of Havelok the Dane," *Medium Ævum* 45 (1976): 36–49, reprinted in *Middle English Dialectology: Essays on Some Principles and Problems*, ed. Margaret Laing (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1989), 224–236, at 229 with sigla altered.

Bury St Edmunds and Norfolk in the Anglo-Saxon period

Bury's standing and pre-eminence among the religious houses of East Anglia may be attributed almost entirely to the efforts of Baldwin, abbot between 1065 and 1097, whose reign is justly described by Gransden as "crucial" to the fortunes of the foundation,⁴² and indeed to the growth of the town itself. As Emma Cownie has observed, the stroke of luck in having a French abbot (particularly one as able as Baldwin) in place in an English monastery just before the Norman Conquest was a considerable one, and allowed Bury to adapt to the new regime remarkably quickly.⁴³ Baldwin's attention to matters such as the acquisition of a mint and moneyer led to a doubling of the town's value and size between the reign of Edward the Confessor and the Domesday Book survey. LDB records that 342 new houses had been built on previously arable land with 310 houses already recorded at the time of the Conquest. This gives an estimated population for the growing town of over 3,000.⁴⁴ Bury's increased wealth during the period is in sharp contrast to other East Anglian towns: Norwich, Thetford, and Ipswich all suffered as a result of the Conquest. Baldwin's influence at court as physician to Edward the Confessor, William I and William Rufus was undoubtedly key to Bury's continued gains during this period.

Despite its later wealth, prestige and number of surviving records, however, the early history of the abbey of Bury St Edmunds is debated.⁴⁵ A large wooden church at *Beodricesworth*, served by secular clerks, appears to have been built by the mid-tenth century to house St Edmund's body.⁴⁶ During Cnut's reign, probably in 1032, a new

⁴² Antonia Gransden, "Baldwin, Abbot of Bury St Edmunds, 1065–1097," *Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies* 4 (1981): 65–76, at 76.

⁴³ Emma Cownie, "Religious Patronage at Post-Conquest Bury St. Edmunds," *The Haskins Society Journal* 7 (1995): 1–9, at 8.

⁴⁴ H. C. Darby, *The Domesday Geography of Eastern England*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), at 198.

⁴⁵ David Dumville's summary of what is and what is not known about the origins of the foundation is helpful and succinct (*English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism AD 950–1030* (Cambridge: Boydell, 1993), 35–48), and the information here is jointly derived from his account and that of Antonia Gransden, "The Cult of St Mary at *Beodericisworth* and then in Bury St Edmunds Abbey," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004): 627–653. See also Antonia Gransden, "The Legends and Traditions Concerning the Origins of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds," *The English Historical Review* 100 (1985): 1–24.

⁴⁶ Antonia Gransden discusses the possibility that King Sigeberht's minster, mentioned by Bede, was sited at Bury ("The Cult of St Mary at *Beodericisworth*," 629).

church was consecrated dedicated jointly to St Mary and St Edmund. The period between these two events is especially obscure. What we do know is that the first abbot of the reformed Benedictine monastery was Ufi (1020–1044), the prior of St Benet's at Holm, Norfolk. There was a tradition current at Holm from the late thirteenth century that Bury was populated by half the community of St Benet's following expulsion of the secular clerks. The account is not without problems and was initially dismissed by Antonia Gransden;⁴⁷ recently, however, her view on the matter has changed, partly as a result of charter evidence which appears to link the two foundations from a comparatively early date.⁴⁸ Certainly, the presence of Ufi (and his successor, Leofstan, another of the pioneering monks from Holm) cannot be gainsaid, and the fact that each of the twelve monks who departed for Bury is named in the foundation account lends an air of plausibility to the narrative. St Benet's links with the abbey later are indisputable; it is certain that Bury had entered into confraternity with Holm by the late thirteenth century, and likely that such an arrangement existed early in that century.⁴⁹ Indeed, it was to Holm that the sacrist, William Stowe, fled after the riots of 1326–1327.⁵⁰

The cult of St Edmund

Links to Norfolk were potentially also strengthened by the importance of the cult of St Edmund in that county, a cult which was promulgated highly successfully in the immediate post-Conquest years by Abbot Baldwin. It seems that King Edmund was acknowledged as a saint within a quarter century of his death (869) at the hands of the Danes. Baldwin's programme of rebuilding the abbey in Romanesque style culminated in the ceremony of April 1095 at which St Edmund's

⁴⁷ Gransden, "Legends," 15–17.

⁴⁸ See Simon Keynes, "Cnut's Earls," in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway*, ed. Alexander R. Rumble (London: Leicester University Press, 1994), 43–88, at 49 n. 39. Gransden now accepts some role for St. Benet's: "it is surely true that St Benets was involved in the new monastery's foundation" (Gransden, "The Cult of St Mary at Beodercisworth," 632).

⁴⁹ Gransden, "Legends," 17.

⁵⁰ "Houses of Benedictine Monks: The Abbey of St Benet of Holm," in *A History of the County of Norfolk: Volume 2*, ed. William Page (London: Archibald Constable, 1906), 330–336, <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=38263>> (accessed March 11, 2008).

relics were moved to the new church.⁵¹ This established Bury as a principal pilgrimage shrine, helped in the first instance by an aggressive marketing ploy by the attendant bishop, Walkelin of Winchester, who announced an indulgence to visitors.⁵² Through his continental contacts, Baldwin extended the dissemination of the cult abroad, travelling with relics and making gifts of them to various of his acquaintances. At his request, the monk Hermann wrote his *De miraculis sancti Eadmundi* at some point after 1095, in which we learn about these events.⁵³ The connection between success of the cult and success of the foundation, as Gransden observes, was recognised early on,⁵⁴ but it was Baldwin through his royal connections and the promotion of the saint's cult who significantly improved the record of gift-giving and, crucially, secured confirmation of privileges granted (or allegedly granted) before the Conquest. Although over forty churches are listed by Hervey outside Norfolk and Suffolk that are dedicated to St Edmund,⁵⁵ the saint is unsurprisingly particularly popular in East Anglia; indeed, he may be regarded as "principal" within Norfolk, where he comes ninth in order of dedications.⁵⁶

⁵¹ For the establishment of the cult, see chapter two (pp. 24–62) of Simon Yarrow, *Saints and their Communities*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁵² Yarrow, *Saints*, 24.

⁵³ The work is edited by Thomas Arnold in his *Memorials of St Edmund's Abbey*, Rolls Series, 3 vols. (London: HMSO, 1890–1896) 1:26–92.

⁵⁴ Gransden, "The Cult of St Mary at Beodericisworth", 638.

⁵⁵ Lord Francis Hervey, *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi: The Garland of Saint Edmund King and Martyr* (London: John Murray, 1907), 624–626, a list which, as Thomson observes, and I demonstrate below, is certainly incomplete (*The Chronicle of the Election of Hugh*, ed. and trans. Rodney Thomson, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974), xlii). The numbers for Yorkshire (six listed in Hervey not specifically noted as modern) in fact exceed those given for Suffolk (five, although to this may be added Hargrave). As if to compensate for this, several more recent churches have been dedicated to St. Edmund, including Bungay (Roman Catholic), Bury St Edmunds (RC), Felixstowe (one joint dedication with St. John the Baptist; one joint dedication with St. Felix (orthodox)), Halesworth (RC), Withermarsh Green (RC, joint dedication with Our Lady Immaculate).

⁵⁶ Linnell lists twenty-one churches dedicated to St. Edmund in medieval times to which one (Lyng) may be added (C. L. S. Linnell, *Norfolk Church Dedications*, St Anthony's Hall Publications 21 (York: St Anthony's, 1962), 39). Although the problem in attempting to assign dedications to medieval churches is a real one, Linnell supplements his research with evidence from medieval wills which makes his findings more robust. The list includes two (at Acle and at Swanton Novers) which may instead have been dedicated to St. Edward. Additional to Hervey's list (see note 54 above) are Foulden, Markshall, Norwich, Snareshill and Thurne. The church at Walpole Highway, listed in Hervey, is of comparatively recent construction. I am very grateful to Mr Simon Knott who provided me with much assistance on this point, and whose

The monastic community in the thirteenth century

The strong links between St Edmund's and Norfolk is borne out by the contemporary account of the fraught election dispute following the death of Abbot Samson in 1212 which provides us with a snapshot of the demographic of the community at Bury.⁵⁷ The account supplies the names of those voting in the election, some seventy-one in total. Of these, forty-two have locative surnames, potentially allowing their birthplaces to be identified.⁵⁸ Some care needs to be taken in assessing these figures. For example, despite his surname, the monk Hugh of Hastings is known to have been born in Suffolk as their family had claimed a hereditary right to the stewardship.⁵⁹ Place-names which cannot be attributed to a specific county with certainty have been removed from the lists: these are Graveley (two examples: Herts or Cam), Bradfield (almost certainly Suffolk but also perhaps Essex or Norfolk),⁶⁰ Newport (Essex or Berks), and the topographical surname du Bois. Thomson has established the birthplace of a further two individuals from other records (Gregory, born near St Albans, and the local man Robert Fitzdrew).⁶¹ In the lists, I have also included an indication of distance from Bury using a modern road network for those places within a hundred miles of the foundation.

From Suffolk

Beccles, Thomas (44 miles)

Diss, John (22 miles)⁶²

Diss, William (22 miles)

From Norfolk

Brooke, Alan (50 miles)

Hingham, Richard (34 miles)

Lynn, Henry (45 miles)

two sites on East Anglian churches <<http://www.suffolkchurches.co.uk>>, <<http://www.norfolkchurches.co.uk>> contain a rich seam of information.

⁵⁷ The account is edited by Thomson, *Chronicle*, with a very useful introduction.

⁵⁸ Locative surnames in the region are usefully discussed by Richard McKinley, *Norfolk and Suffolk Surnames in Middle Ages*, English Surname Series 2 (London: Phillimore, 1975), 75–106.

⁵⁹ Thomson, *Chronicle*, 186. In two cases I am not aware of Thomson's evidence for his identifications and have therefore omitted the names: these are Richard de Flamvill (whom Thomson, *Chronicle*, 187 has as Suffolk-born) and Robert of St. Botolph (186, Norfolk-born, presumably after Morley St Botolph, but there are many other East Anglian churches of this name, and I do not know when Morley acquired the qualifier).

⁶⁰ Bradfield Combust is only six miles from Bury (compare sixty-four from Bradfield Nf and forty-one from Bradfield Ess).

⁶¹ Thomson, *Chronicle*, 184.

⁶² Diss was returned under the Suffolk hundred of Hartismere in LDB.

Fitzdrew, Robert (not known)	Lynn, Peter (45 miles)
Hastings, Hugh (not known)	Northwold, Hugh (42 miles)
Lavenham, John (12 miles)	Northwold, Roger (42 miles)
Saxham, Richard (5 miles)	Stanhoe, William (53 miles) ⁶³
St Edmunds, John	Thompson, William (27 miles)
Stonham, Roger ⁶⁴ (23 miles)	Tivetshall, Peter (29 miles)
Thetford, Hugh (13 miles) ⁶⁵	Walsingham, Alan (53 miles)
Wordwell, Peter (6 miles)	Walsingham, Simon (53 miles)
Brakelond, Jocelin	Walsingham, Thomas (53 miles)
	Worstead, Peter (58 miles) ⁶⁶
From Bedfordshire	
Dunstable, Nicholas (98 miles)	From further afield
	Oxford, R.
From Cambridgeshire	London, Henry
Ely, Henry (25 miles)	London, Ralph
L'isle (Ely), Richard (25 miles)	Scot, A.
	Wales, Alan
From Hertfordshire	Roman, Nicholas
St Albans, Gregory (84 miles) ⁶⁷	
Stortford, Richard (54 miles)	

The numbers coming from Norfolk are significant, and may partly be explained by the popularity of the cult.⁶⁸ This is despite the rival Benedictine institutions founded before the Conquest at Holm in Norfolk and Rumburgh in Suffolk. They were joined before ca. 1150 by, in Norfolk, Binham, Wymondham (both dependencies of St Albans), and Norwich.⁶⁹ Bury's superior wealth was probably sufficient in itself to have drawn the more ambitious to the foundation: the taxation roll of 1291 shows that its estimated income at almost £1000

⁶³ Thomson notes that he normalizes to the forms given in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, ed. Eilert Ekwall, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947), but gives the name as Stanham (185).

⁶⁴ Thetford was in Suffolk at this time.

⁶⁵ Thomson, *Chronicle*, 184.

⁶⁶ Thomson, *Chronicle*, 186 lists as "Stanhope".

⁶⁷ Thomson, *Chronicle*, 187 "Wortheast".

⁶⁸ Thomson himself adduces the cult as a reason for the marked regional support for the local candidate, Hugh of Northwold (*Chronicle*, xlii, xliii). See also the powerful statement on the same subject by Alison Binns, *Dedications of Monastic Houses in England and Wales 1066-1216*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1989), 55 with an example drawn from St. Edmund's.

⁶⁹ See the maps in Janet Burton, *Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 1000-1300*, Cambridge Medieval Textbooks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 6, 40-41.

was more than double that of its closest East Anglian rival, Norwich.⁷⁰ Such factors may have persuaded Alan of Brooke, for example, to have travelled the fifty miles to Bury rather than the eight to Norwich, or Peter of Worstead to have travelled fifty-eight miles to the foundation rather than nine to Holm or fourteen to Norwich. In Alan's case, the close proximity of two churches dedicated to St Edmund, at Caistor St Edmund and Markshall (both around five miles away from Brooke), may have helped him reach his decision.

The monastic community in the sixteenth century

However, these rival East Anglian foundations do appear finally to have eaten into Bury's potential catchment area. In 1539, the surrender was signed and pensions assigned to forty-three individuals.⁷¹ This list presents a rather different demographic from that of 1212. All but one of the forty-three have locative surnames. Of these, four are uncertain: three are probably in Suffolk although other adjacent counties are possible (Bradfield, Needham and Rougham),⁷² and one, Barton, is too common a place-name to attribute with any certainty.

From Suffolk

Bardwell, Simon (10 miles)
Bury, Edmund
Bury, John
Claydon, John (24 miles)
Denston, Thomas (11 miles)
Diss, Thomas (22 miles)

From Norfolk

Attleborough, Humphrey (29 miles)
Foulden, John (26 miles)
Lopham, John (19 miles)
Norwich, Ralph (24 miles)
Walsingham, John (53 miles)

⁷⁰ Burton observes that the wealthiest houses were those whose origins lay before the Norman Conquest (*Monastic Orders*, 234). *VCH* puts Bury fifth among the Benedictine abbey in England behind Westminster, Glastonbury, St Albans and Christ Church Canterbury ("Houses of Benedictine Monks: Abbey of Bury St Edmunds," *A History of the County of Suffolk: Volume 2*, ed. William Page (London: Archibald Constable, 1907), 56–72. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.asp?compid=37880>> (accessed August 15, 2007).

⁷¹ The surrender is printed in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, 22 vols. (London: Longman, 1864–1932), 14/2:462.

⁷² For Bradfield, see note 59 above. Needham (Sf) is eight miles from Bury, Rougham seven; their Norfolk namesakes are twenty-nine and forty miles respectively.

Dunwich, Peter (47 miles)	From Essex
Elmswell, William (10 miles)	Halstead, Ailot (25 miles)
Hadleigh, John (21 miles) ⁷³	Harlow, Thomas (58 miles)
Hessett, Robert (8 miles)	Maldon, Roger (77 miles)
Hessett, Thomas (8 miles)	Thaxted, William (32 miles)
Hinderclay, Robert (16 miles)	
Honington, Robert (12 miles)	From Cambridgeshire
Icklingham, John (9 miles)	Cambridge, John (27 miles)
Ipswich, Thomas (28 miles)	Ely, Gregory (26 miles)
Lavenham, John (12 miles)	Northamptonshire
Melford ?, Oliver (14 miles)	Warkton, Ranulph (67 miles)
Melford ?, John (14 miles)	
Mildenhall, Thomas (13 miles)	
Stonham, Thomas (23 miles)	
Sudbury, Thomas (17 miles)	
Westgate, John	
Wetherden, Edmund (12 miles)	
Woolpit ? (< 'Wolspett'), John (11 miles)	
Woolpit ?, John (11 miles)	

Once again, this information must be assessed cautiously. It is clear that some had left the monastery, and we therefore have no way of telling from where they may have originated. In 1535, the visitors to Bury noted that the convent totalled sixty-two monks. Those who had been under twenty when they had taken their vows or who were under twenty-four years of age at the time of visitation were dismissed, reducing the total to fifty-six.⁷⁴ Another thirteen seem to have disappeared between visitation and surrender. Nevertheless the difference between the constitution of the convent in the thirteenth century and the sixteenth is evident, with around 68 percent coming from within Suffolk and 14 percent from Norfolk compared with 32 percent from Suffolk and 35 percent from Norfolk in the earlier period.⁷⁵ It may be noted that the figures from within East Anglia itself, however, remain stable. Perhaps more relevantly given that some settlements in Norfolk are closer to Bury than are some in Suffolk, monks seem to travelled

⁷³ This is much closer to Bury than the Hadleigh in Herts (fifty-one miles) or Essex (seventy-eight miles).

⁷⁴ "Houses of Benedictine monks." For discussion of this point, see David Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948–1959), 3:282.

⁷⁵ McKinley notes that by this period most surnames would have been hereditary for several generations (*Norfolk and Suffolk Surnames*, 20–22; 89), which potentially complicates the issue.

less far from what presumably is their place of origin: an average of twenty-two miles in 1538 compared with thirty-nine miles in 1212; the feel is very much more local.⁷⁶

Although we can see from this that the geographic diversity of the community of Bury seems to have diminished over the period, the strong tradition of recruitment from Norfolk remained very much alive in the late thirteenth century. It is therefore not in the slightest improbable that the scribes of F and A were from that county rather than Bury itself. Indeed it seems more than likely that the scribe of A was a Norfolk man, not just because of the sheer number of Norfolkisms noted by McIntosh and the consistency with which they are copied into that manuscript, but also the occurrence of an isolated spelling recorded in Norfolk but not in Suffolk of SHALL as *sal* in the wills alongside *sch-* everywhere else (including the copytext F).⁷⁷

Relict forms and repertoires

Another factor, however, should be considered: the strongly conservative force exerted by these texts in terms of language. In their now classic account of scribal copying practice, Michael Benskin and Margaret Laing elaborated on an observation originally made by Angus McIntosh, that a scribe had three potential approaches to his text written in a dialect other than his own: he may choose to copy it *literatim* (rare), he may translate it fully into his variety of English (common), or he may produce something between the two (most frequent of all), a *Mischsprache*. Benskin and Laing rehearsed some useful terminology in relation to scribal habits relevant here. The first is the notion of a "relict," "a form not part of a scribe's own dialect, but an exotic that is perpetuated from an exemplar whose dialect differs from that of the copyist."⁷⁸ The second is the distinction between active and passive repertoire, active being part of the scribe's spontaneous usage, and

⁷⁶ This figure excludes those coming from more than a hundred miles away in the 1212 lists.

⁷⁷ Angus McIntosh, M. L. Samuels, and M. Benskin, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* (henceforth *LALME*), 4 vols. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1986), 4:37 item 22.

⁷⁸ Michael Benskin and Margaret Laing, "Translations and *Mischsprachen* in Middle English Manuscripts," in *So Meny People Longages and Tonges: Philological Essays in Scots and Mediaeval English Presented to Angus McIntosh*, ed. Michael Benskin and M. L. Samuels (Edinburgh: privately printed, 1981), 55–106, at 58.

passive being “those forms which are not part of the active repertoire, but which are nevertheless familiar in everyday usage as the forms of other writers, and which the scribe does not balk at reproducing.”⁷⁹ The difficulty of translating Old English texts into Middle English of any kind should not be underestimated as it requires a high degree of linguistic competence; the achievement of F in doing so with relatively few relict forms is considerable when compared with the efforts of his peers both at Bury and elsewhere. This is especially the case given that half of the texts he was set to copy were vernacular wills, far more challenging in terms of their lexis and syntax than the writs which generally formed the pre-Conquest diet of cartulary scribes. In copies of Old English material elsewhere, relict forms abound. To give an example that I have discussed in more detail elsewhere: the <eo> spelling in *freondlice* in one eleventh-century writ (S 1069) was retained in a sequence of some seventeen copies of Exchequer- and Chancery-produced confirmation charters and enrolments for two hundred years all the way through to the early sixteenth century!⁸⁰ The Bury cartulary copies of the confirmation charters (all fourteenth- or fifteenth-century productions) meekly reproduce the diphthongal spelling and, as time goes on, scribes are markedly less prepared to update the language of their exemplars in any way. This is undoubtedly in large part attributable to difficulties of comprehension, but such difficulties create an important knock-on effect: where a later scribe is copying an Old English text that has been partly updated, those updated forms themselves together with any dialectal information they supply are likely become fossilized in further, later copies. In other words, such forms need not be classified as items of the transmitter’s passive vocabulary but instead constitute relicts.

Passive repertoire is, however, likely to have contributed to the reproduction of updated forms. One example will suffice. In 1333 Walter Pinchbeck began to put together a series of documents relating, *inter alia*, to the liberties of the abbey. His original register survives as Cambridge, University Library Ee. 3. 60, and is believed by Rodney Thomson to be in his own hand. Pinchbeck itself is in Lincolnshire, around two miles north of Spalding. Pinchbeck copied

⁷⁹ Benskin and Laing, “Translations and *Mischsprachen*,” 59.

⁸⁰ “The Exchequer, the Chancery, and the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds: *Inspeximus* Charters and their Enrolments,” *English Manuscript Studies* 14 (2008): 1–26.

a series of Anglo-Saxon writs from the abbey almost certainly from the lost Northwold register.⁸¹ His copies are certainly worth comparing in detail with F and A, also derived from Northwold, but a form which immediately sticks out once again is the adverb ending in *-like* which is recorded in *LALME* only in ERY, WRY, NW Norfolk (in the King's Lynn, Fakenham, Hunstanton triangle) and in Northern Middle English (i.e. north of the Humber-Lune line).⁸² How are we to assess this form? Might *-like* have formed part of Walter's passive repertoire, or is it better described as a relict? It is unlikely that Walter back at home in Lincolnshire would have heard anybody routinely using this form to the extent that he thought it acceptable to reproduce it—King's Lynn is around thirty miles' distant—but he would have been exposed to a very wide range of accents and dialects in the precincts, refectory and cloisters of a monastery such as Bury. In other words, the passive repertoire of the foundation's scribes would have been far greater than that of other scribes of the area. Although, then, it seems we can speak with confidence of dialectal differences between Norfolk and Suffolk during the period, we need not be surprised when the output from Bury appears contradictory or confusing.

Conclusions

The pre-Conquest evidence from Bury presented above shows that a sound change traditionally described as Kentish, whereby all front monophthongs other than /i/ fell together as /e/, had extended by the late Anglo-Saxon period to Bury. There is no useable pre-Conquest material from Norfolk, although later evidence from place- and personal-names strongly suggests that the change had not spread to that county. Several scholars have noted a number of dialect features to be found in Norfolk but not in Suffolk in the later Middle Ages. Many such Norfolkisms are to be found in the cartulary copies of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century pre-Conquest charters from Bury. This is almost certainly because of the demonstrably strong Norfolk contingent within the monastic community during the period, drawn to the abbey because of its wealth and the popularity of the cult of St Edmund within Norfolk. Other factors, however, need to be taken into

⁸¹ See "The Exchequer".

⁸² *LALME*, 4:203 item 278.

consideration when assessing the dialectal value of these texts, and we should certainly not rush to redraw our dialect maps on the basis of the evidence they supply. The unfamiliar language of the ultimate Anglo-Saxon exemplars promotes the retention of a large number of relict forms from both the original Old English and from intermediate copies. Such conservative copying habits result in dialectally inconsistent texts. Another important complicating issue is the cosmopolitan nature of a large and important abbey such as Bury. Scribes working in such a community are likely to display a greater degree of tolerance for forms outwith their own active repertoire than would their colleagues from a smaller, more homogeneous community.

Where does all this leave us? Although the Old English material considered here is liminal in terms of date and affected by standardisation, there is no better evidence for the language of the area in the pre-Conquest period. We need to make the most of it. In terms of the cartulary material the same largely applies: those, for example, working on the *Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* has to take account of the evidence supplied by at least some of these texts in order to approach any kind of adequate geographical coverage in the couple of centuries or so after the Conquest, even though their language is seriously compromised by their being copies of Old English material.⁸³ When evaluating the evidence supplied by these texts we cannot afford to ignore or be ignorant of the multiple contexts surrounding their production. For the historical linguist, there are challenges in the interpretation of this data that can only be met by a thorough understanding of manuscript transmission coupled with sociohistorical engagement of the type outlined here.

⁸³ A careful assessment of the position is given by Laing and Lass in their online introduction to the project available at <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1_frames.html> (accessed March 09 2009), based largely on Margaret Laing's earlier statements in "Anchor texts and literary manuscripts in early Middle English," in *Regionalism in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts*, ed. Felicity Riddy (Cambridge: Brewer, 1991), 27–52, at 38–40, and "Never the twain shall meet: Early Middle English—the east-west divide," in *Placing Middle English into Context*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Päivi Pahta and Matti Rissanen, *Topics in English Linguistics* 53 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), 97–124, at 105–7.

Appendix

Note: place-name elements and etymologies are largely based on Eilert Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960) and A. H. Smith, *English Place-Name Elements*, English Place-Name Society 25, 26, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1956). Personal-name elements are derived from Olof von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*, *Nomina Germanica* 3 (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1937).

S 1489

	<e>	example	expected form	example
æ ¹	2	þer 'there'	1 (æ)	mæge 'kinsman'
æ ²	2	hlefdigen 'lady'	2 (æ)	ærest 'first'
first fronting /a/	11	et 'at'	6 (æ/a)	mæge < <i>magan</i> 'be able to'
i-mut /α/	0		9 (æ/a)	Ælfwine (pn)
i-mut /u:/	0		0	
i-mut /u/	3	Leofwenne pn	4 (y)	byrig 'town'
TOTAL	18		22	

æ¹ <e> spellings: Elig (Ely Ca < æl), þerto 'thereto'; <æ> spellings: mæge 'kinsman';⁸⁴ æ² <e> spellings: hlefdigen 'lady', gelesta (3rd pers sg pres subj < *gelæstan*); <æ> spellings: ærest 'first', Eggemæra (Egmere Nf < *mære*),⁸⁵ gelæste (3rd pers sg pres subj < *gelæstan*)⁸⁶

⁸⁴ Here may also belong the second element of Gæssæte (Guist Nf) if it is from *sæte* 'house'; however, it could be an inverse spelling (< *geset*, 'fold').

⁸⁵ This could alternatively be an inverse spelling if the second element is from *mere* 'lake' (Ekwall, *English Place-Names*, s.n.).

⁸⁶ Here may also belong the first element of Gæssæte (Guist Nf) assuming, with Ekwall, that it is from an OE personal name *Gæga, *Gægi perhaps related to OE *gægan* 'turn aside' (Ekwall, *English Place-Names*, s.n. Guist, Gayton).

first fronting /a/ <e> spellings: et × 11 ‘at’; <æ> spellings: akera ‘acre’, æt, fatfylre < *fæt* ‘cup’, mæge, mage (3rd pers sg pres subj < *magan*), þæt
i-mutation /ɑ/ <æ> spellings: Ægelrice (< *Æðel*), Ælffæh, Ælffwig, Ælffwine, Ælfric × 2 (< *Ælf* ‘elf’), hæbbe (1st pers pres sg < *habban*), hæfð (3rd pers pres sg < *habban*), Walsingaham (Walsingham Nf < *Wæls*) × 2

i-mutation /u/ <e> spellings: Fersafeld (Fersfield Nf < *fyr*s ‘furze’), Leofwenne (< *wynn* ‘joy’); <y> spellings: byrig ‘town’, fatfylre (< *fyllere* ‘bearer’), myln, mylne ‘mill’

inverse spellings <æ> for <e>: Ælmham (Elmham Nf < *elm* ‘elm’);⁸⁷ <e> for <y>: derast × 2 (< *dýre* ‘expensive’)

	#	example
<æ> for <e>	1	Ælmham (pn)
<e> for <y>	2	derast < <i>dýre</i> ‘expensive’

S 1225

	<e>	example	expected form	example
$\bar{æ}^1$	0		0	
$\bar{æ}^2$	0		0	
first fronting /a/	0		2 (æ)	wæs < <i>wesan</i> ‘be’
<i>i</i> -mut /ɑ/	0		0	
<i>i</i> -mut /u:/	0		0	
<i>i</i> -mut /u/	0		0	
TOTAL	0		2	

first fronting /a/ <æ> spellings: æt × 2, wæs (3rd pers pret sg < *wesan*)
 inverse spellings <y> for <e> : sendan (3rd pers pres pl < *bēon*), Purkytel (< ON *þorkell*); <æ> for <e>: stænt (3rd pers pres sg < *standan*)

⁸⁷ See note above.

	#	example
<y> for <e>	2	þurkytel (pn)
<æ> for <e>	1	stænt < <i>standan</i> 'stand'

S 1486/S 1494 (main text)

	<e>	example	expected form	example
æ ¹	5	þer 'there'	10 (æ)	becwædon < <i>becweðan</i> 'bequeath'
æ ²	10	þeræ dat sg fem det	6 (æ)	æhta 'possessions'
first fronting /a/	38	wes < <i>wesan</i> 'be'	96 (æ)	fæder 'father'
i-mut /α/	1	nebbe < <i>nabban</i> 'have not'	6 (æ/a)	hæbbæ < <i>habban</i> 'have'
i-mut /u:/	4	brece 'use'	2 (ȳ)	Æþældryð (pn)
i-mut /u/	1	Fulanpettæ pn	4 (y)	byrig 'town'
TOTAL	59		124	

æ¹ <e> spellings: Æþelfled 'e' (< **flæd* 'beauty'), Eðelmere (< WG **mār*),⁸⁸ megæ 'kinsman', Stredfordæ (Stratford Sf < *stræt*), þer 'there'; <æ> spellings: Ælflæd (< **flæd* 'beauty'), Ælig (Ely Ca < *æl*), Æþælmære, Eðelmære (< WG **mār*), bæcwædon, becwædon (3rd pers pret pl < *becweðan* 'bequeath'), mægæ 'kinsman', Strætforda (Stratford Sf < *stræt*), þær 'there', þærto 'thereto'

æ² <e> spellings: elcum 'each', 'er', er × 3 'before', erest 'first', dele (3rd pers pres subj < *dælan* 'share', Hedlæge (Hadleigh Sf < *hæp* 'heath'), þeræ × 2 (dat sg fem det); <æ> spellings: æhta 'possessions', ælcum 'each', ærest 'first' × 2, Sægham (Soham Ca < *sæ* 'lake'), þæræ (dat/gen sg fem det)

first fronting /a/ <e> spellings: ef[ter], efter, efter 'after', et × 2, Eðelmere (< *æpel* 'noble'), deg × 6, degæ × 6, degæ × 2 'day', pellas 'robe',

⁸⁸ Von Feilitzen, *Pre-Conquest Personal Names*, 325–26.

Rettendune (Rettendon Ess < ?*rættēn* ‘infested with rats’), þes × 13, þe ‘s’ (masc/neut gen sg det), þet (neut acc sg det), wes (3rd pers pret sg < *wesan* ‘be’); <æ> spellings: æfter, æfter × 3, æftær × 2 ‘after’, æt × 50 ‘at’, Æþelfled ‘e’, Æþældryð, Æþældryþe, Æþælmære, Æðelmære (< *æþel* ‘noble’), dæg × 20, dæge × 2 ‘day’, fæder ‘father’, fæt ‘cup’, gemacan ‘pair’, þæs × 10, ðæs (masc/neut gen sg det)

i-mutation /ɑ/ <e> spellings: nebbe (1st pers pres sg < *nabban* ‘not have’); <æ> spellings: Ælesforda (< *Ægel* < *Æþel* ‘noble’ Aylesford K), Ælflæd, Ælfgæate, Ælþ ‘r’ æðe, Alfwolde (< *ælf* ‘elf’), hæbbæ (1st pers pres sg < *habban* ‘have’)

i-mutation /u:/ <e> spellings: brece × 3, bre[ce] ‘use’ (noun < *brūcan*); <y> spellings: Æþældryð, Æþældryþe (< *ðrȳð* ‘might’)

i-mutation /u/ <e> spellings: Fulanpettæ (Beaumont (!) Ess < *pytt* ‘pit’); <i, y> spellings: byrig ‘town’, cinges × 3 ‘king’

inverse spellings <y> for <e> Ægwinæ (< *Ecg* ‘edge’), Byrætune (Barton ?Ess < *bere-* ‘barley’), Grænstydæ × 2 (< *stede* ‘place’ Greenstead Ess), Læxadyne (Lexden Ess < *denu* ‘valley’), Myresigæ, Myresige, Myræsegæ, Myresie (Mersea Ess < *mere* ‘sea’), Polstydæ (Polstead Sf < *stede* ‘place’), Wifærmyrsc × 2 (Withermarsh Sf < *mersc* ‘marsh’), Ylmesæton, Ylmesætun (Elmsett Sf < **elme* ‘elm-grove’),⁸⁹ <y> for <æ>: Ylig (Ely Ca < *æl*); <æ> for <e>: æaldormæn (dat sg ‘aldorman’), mæte ‘produce’, Pætres (< Lat *Petrus*), geræfan ‘reeve’, Stanwægūn (Stanway Ess < *weg* ‘road’), stænt (3rd pers pres sg < *standan*), þæ (2nd pers dat sg pn), þæ rel pn × 6, twægra ‘two’, Wæaldingafælda (Waldingfield Sf < *feld* ‘field’); <æ> for <y> Ælþ ‘r’ æðe (< *ðrȳð* ‘might’)

	#	Example
<æ> for <e>	15	mæte ‘food’
<y> for <e>	14	Byrætune (pn)
<æ> for <y>	1	Ælþ ‘r’ æðe (pn)
<y> for <æ>	1	Ylig (pn)

⁸⁹ Ekwall (*English Place-Names* s.n.) notes that the second element of this may be from *-sætan* ‘dwellers’, *sæte* ‘house’ (æ¹) or from *geset* ‘fold’. In view of this uncertainty it is not included above.

Boundary clause to S 1486

	<e>	example	expected form	example
æ ¹	0		3 (æ)	þær 'there'
æ ²	0		11 (æ)	gemære 'boundary'
first fronting /a/	0		5 (æ)	
i-mut /α/	0		0	
i-mut /u:/	0		4 (y)	cymð < <i>cuman</i> 'come'
i-mut /u/	0		0	
TOTAL	0		23	

æ¹ <æ> spellings: stanstræte × 2 'paved road', þær 'there'

æ² <æ> spellings: Hædleage × 2 (Hadleigh Sf < *hæþ* 'heath'), gemære × 6, gæmære × 2 'boundary', landgemæra 'boundary'

first fronting /a/ <æ> spellings: æt 'at', æfter 'after', Bindhæcce (< *hæcc* 'hatch' unidentified), Tudanhæcce × 2 (< *hæcc* 'hatch' unidentified)

i-mutation /y/: <y> spellings: cymð × 3 (3rd pers pres sg < *cuman* 'come'), scrybbe 'shrub'

inverse spellings <y> for <e>: Byligesdyne (Balsdon Hall Sf < ?*denu* 'valley'), Loppandyne × 2 (< ?*denu* 'valley' unidentified); <æ> for <e>: æft 'back'

	#	Example
<æ> for <e>	1	æft 'back'
<y> for <e>	3	Loppandyne [?] (pn)

Works Cited

- Anderson, John. 1988. The Great Kentish Collapse. In *Luick Revisited*, ed. Dieter Kastovsky and Gero Bauer, Tübingen Beiträge zur Linguistik 288, 97–107. Tübingen: Narr.
- Arnold, Thomas. 1890–1896. *Memorials of St Edmund's Abbey*, Rolls Series, 3 vols. London: HMSO.
- Michael Benskin. 1994. Descriptions of Dialect and Areal Distributions. In *Speaking in Our Tongues: Proceedings of a Colloquium of Medieval Dialectology and Related Disciplines*, ed. Margaret Laing and Keith Williamson, 169–187. Cambridge: Brewer.
- Benskin, Michael and Margaret Laing. 1981. Translations and *Mischsprachen* in Middle English Manuscripts. In *So Meny People Longages and Tonges: Philological Essays in Scots and Mediaeval English Presented to Angus McIntosh*, ed. Michael Benskin and M. L. Samuels, 55–106. Edinburgh: privately printed.
- Binns, Alison. 1989. *Dedications of Monastic Houses in England and Wales 1066–1216*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion. Woodbridge: Boydell.
- Burton, Janet. 1994. *Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 1000–1300*, Cambridge Medieval Textbooks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, H. E., ed. 1949. *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond*. London: Nelson.
- Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Carlsson, Stig. 1989. *Studies on Middle English Local Bynames in East Anglia*, Lund Studies in English 79. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Cownie, Emma. 1995. Religious Patronage at Post-Conquest Bury St Edmunds. *The Haskins Society Journal* 7: 1–9.
- Crowley, Joseph P. 1986. The Study of Old English Dialects. *English Studies* 67: 97–112.
- Darby, H. C. 1971. *The Domesday Geography of Eastern England*, 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Douglas, David C. 1927. *The Social Structure of Medieval East Anglia*, Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History 9. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Dumville, David. 1993. *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism AD 950–1030*. Cambridge: Boydell.
- Ekwall, Eilert, ed. 1947. *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- , ed. 1960. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Feilitzen, Olof von. 1937. *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*, Nomina Germanica 3. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.
- Fisiak, Jacek. 1988. Old East Anglian: A Problem in Old English Dialectology. *AUMLA Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association* 70: 336–365. Repr. in 2001. *East Anglian English*, ed. Jacek Fisiak and Peter Trudgill, 13–38. Cambridge: Brewer.
- , *Domesday Book and Late Old English Dialects*. In *Historical Linguistics 1987*, ed. Henning Andersen and Konrad Koerner, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 66, 107–128. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gransden, Antonia. 1981. Baldwin, Abbot of Bury St Edmunds, 1065–1097. *Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies* 4: 65–76.
- . 1985. The Legends and Traditions Concerning the Origins of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds. *The English Historical Review* 100: 1–24.
- . 2004. The Cult of St Mary at Beodericisworth and then in Bury St Edmunds Abbey. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55: 627–653.
- . 2007. *A History of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds 1182–1256*. Woodbridge: Boydell.
- Hogg, Richard M. 1992. *A Grammar of Old English. Volume 1: Phonology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Keynes, Simon. 1994. Cnut's Earls. In *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway*, ed. Alexander R. Rumble, 43–88. London: Leicester University Press.
- Knowles, David. 1948–1959. *The Religious Orders in England*, 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kristensson, Gillis. 2001. Languages in Contact: Old East Saxon and East Anglian. In *East Anglian English*, ed. Jacek Fisiak and Peter Trudgill, 63–70. Cambridge: Brewer. Repr. from *Studies in Anglistics*, ed. Gunnel Melchers and Beatrice Warren, 259–268. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- . 1997. The Old English Anglian/Saxon Boundary Revisited. In *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*, ed. Jacek Fisiak, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 103, 271–281. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hervey, Lord Francis. 1907. *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi: The Garland of Saint Edmund King and Martyr*, 624–626. London: Murray.
- Jordan, Richard. 1974. *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology*, trans. and rev. Eugene J. Crook, Janua Linguarum Series Practica 218. The Hague: Mouton.
- Laing, Margaret. 1991. Anchor Texts and Literary Manuscripts in Early Middle English. In *Regionalism in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts*, ed. Felicity Riddy, 27–52. Cambridge: Brewer.
- . 2000. *Never the Twain shall Meet: Early Middle English—the East-West Divide*. In *Placing Middle English into Context*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Päivi Pahta and Matti Rissanen, Topics in English Linguistics 53, 97–124. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, 22 vols. (London: Longman, 1864–1932)
- Linnell, C. L. S. 1962. *Norfolk Church Dedications*, St Anthony's Hall Publications 21. York: St Anthony's.
- Lowe, Kathryn A. 1998. The Development of the Anglo-Saxon Boundary Clause. *Nomina* 21: 63–100.
- . 1992. Two Thirteenth-Century Cartularies from Bury St Edmunds: A Study in Textual Transmission. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 93: 293–301.
- . 2003. Sawyer 1070: A Ghost Writ of King Edward the Confessor. *Notes and Queries* 50: 150–152.
- . 2003. The Anglo-Saxon Contents of a Lost Register from Bury St Edmunds. *Anglia* 121: 515–534.
- . 2008. The Exchequer, the Chancery, and the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds: *Inspeximus* Charters and their Enrolments. *English Manuscript Studies* 14: 1–26.
- McIntosh, Angus. 1976. The Language of the Extant Versions of Havelok the Dane. *Medium Ævum* 45: 36–49, reprinted in 1989. *Middle English Dialectology: Essays on Some Principles and Problems*, ed. Margaret Laing, 224–236. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
- McIntosh, Angus, M. L. Samuels, and M. Benskin. 1986. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English (LALME)*, 4 vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
- McKinley, Richard. 1975. *Norfolk and Suffolk Surnames in the Middle Ages*, English Surnames Series 2. London: Phillimore.
- Page, William, ed. 1906. *A History of the County of Norfolk: Volume 2*. London: Constable.
- Robertson, A. J. 1956. *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Studies in English Legal History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rushforth, Rebecca. 2003. The Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century Manuscripts of Bury St Edmunds Abbey. Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge.
- Sawyer, Peter H. 1968. *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*, Royal Historical Guides and Handbooks 8. London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society; revised edition online via <<http://www.esawyer.org.uk>>.
- Smith, A. H. 1956. *English Place-Name Elements*. English Place-Name Society 25, 26, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Thomson, Rodney. 1980. *The Archives of the Abbey of Bury St Edmund*, Suffolk Records Society 21. Cambridge: Boydell.
- , ed. and trans. 1974. *The Chronicle of the Election of Hugh*, Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Whitelock, Dorothy. 1930. *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, Cambridge Studies in English Legal History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williamson, Tom. 2006. *England's Landscape: East Anglia*. London: Collins.
- Yarrow, Simon. 2006. *Saints and their Communities*, Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SENSE AND SENSIBILITY: OLD ENGLISH SEMANTICS AND THE LEXICOGRAPHER'S POINT OF VIEW¹

Antonette diPaolo Healey
University of Toronto

Not very long ago, in April 2005, the English-speaking world celebrated Dr. Samuel Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language*, marking the 250th anniversary of its first publication. The commemorations at that time recognized not only the extraordinary dictionary he produced, lauded as "the book that defined the world,"² but also its author, recently described as "a colossus who bestrode eighteenth-century intellectual England."³ After having completed his task, Dr. Johnson in the "Preface" to his *Dictionary* reflected on the difficulties he had faced in defining the vocabulary of English. Few are as perceptive as he in articulating the daily life of a lexicographer, close relative to the life of the poet, which T.S. Eliot aptly characterized as an "intolerable wrestle with words and meanings."⁴ But Johnson draws an important distinction between the two professions. He labels his original high aspirations for completeness and depth and excellence as the "dreams of a poet," who, brought into contact with the pressures of time, becomes transformed, "doomed at last to wake a lexicographer." In an extended simile, he captures with poignant clarity the frustrating insufficiencies of scholarly research:

¹ An earlier version of this paper was given as a plenary lecture at the 18th International Conference of the Spanish Society of Medieval English Language and Literature at the University of Málaga in October 2006. I am grateful to the Organizing Committee, especially to Profs. Javier Calle Martín, Antonio Miranda García, and David Moreno Olalla, for their kind invitation.

² Henry Hitchings, *Dr Johnson's Dictionary: The Extraordinary Story of the Book that Defined the World* (London: John Murray, 2005).

³ Eric G. Stanley, "Review of Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language in which the WORDS are deduced from their ORIGINALS, and ILLUSTRATED in their DIFFERENT SIGNIFICATIONS by EXAMPLES from the best WRITERS*, Octavo Editions (Oakland, CA, 2005) on CD-ROM," *Notes and Queries* 53 (2006): 2.

⁴ T.S. Eliot, "East Coker II, Four Quartets," in *The Complete Poems and Plays: 1909–1950* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962), 125.

I saw that one enquiry only gave occasion to another, that book referred to book, that to search was not always to find, and to find was not always to be informed; and that thus to pursue perfection was, like the first inhabitants of Arcadia, to chase the sun, which, when they had reached the hill where he seemed to rest, was still beheld at the same distance from them.⁵

"To chase the sun" across more than 42,000 meticulously crafted entries in order to map the English language seems to us a remarkable achievement. That the mapping is done not only with immense learning but also with literary sensitivity is even more remarkable. As Robert Burchfield, the editor of the *Supplement* to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, has remarked, "In the whole tradition of English language and literature the *only* dictionary compiled by a writer of the first rank is that of Dr. Johnson."⁶ But this is the benevolent assessment of a later age, of one lexicographer taking the full measure of another's work from an insider's point of view, as it were. Dr. Johnson could not know that such praise would come to him. And so, in his "Preface," presumably anticipating criticism of the finished product and intending to forestall it, he writes acutely about the magnitude of his task:

A large work is difficult because it is large, even though all its parts might be performed singly with facility; where there are many things to be done, each must be allowed its share of time and labour...; nor can it be expected, that the stones which form the dome of a temple, should be squared and polished like the diamond of a ring.⁷

Despite these mitigating remarks directed to his reading public, and despite immediate consistently positive but unspecific reviews,⁸ total avoidance of criticism was not to be Johnson's fate—not in his time, nor even in our own. Adam Smith, for example, although praising Johnson's *Dictionary* in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1755 as the best yet

⁵ Samuel Johnson, "Preface," in *A Dictionary of the English Language in which the Words are deduced from their ORIGINALS, and ILLUSTRATED in their DIFFERENT SIGNIFICATIONS by EXAMPLES from the best WRITERS*, facsimile edition with a preface by R. W. Burchfield (London: Times Books, 1979), unpaginated.

⁶ *Unlocking the English Language* (London: Faber and Faber, 1989), xi, in which he quotes a portion of the preface he wrote to the facsimile edition of Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* cited above in footnote 5. The emphasis is Burchfield's.

⁷ Johnson, "Preface."

⁸ For a summary of some contemporary assessments of Johnson's *Dictionary*, see Allen Reddick, *The Making of Johnson's 'Dictionary': 1746–1773*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 83–88.

published, noting its originality for being a dictionary of the English language and not simply a dictionary of “hard words and terms of art,” nevertheless criticized the arrangement of the definitions as illogical and confusing. He would have preferred more prescriptive guidance on usage and offered, as an alternative, entries of a more encyclopedic nature, such as his sample entries for the conjunction ‘but’ and the noun ‘humour’ which he juxtaposed with Johnson’s own.⁹ The comments of John Maxwell, a rival lexicographer whose own dictionary was in progress, were fiercer. He praised virtually nothing, finding fault with nearly all, promoting his own private ambition at Johnson’s expense. In the end Johnson prevailed, for Maxwell’s dictionary was so “quixotic” that it never saw final publication.¹⁰

At the risk of being anecdotal, I would like to turn now to a twenty-first-century response to Dr. Johnson. The word in question is ‘lexicographer,’ the definition of which is famously quoted because of Johnson’s brilliant deprecation of his own profession: “Lexicographer: a writer of dictionaries, a **harmless** drudge that busies himself in detailing the signification of words.” When a Professor of Old English recounted this definition to an administrator at a university where a lexicographic project had been ongoing for a number of years, the administrator responded that he didn’t think they were so “harmless” because they cost the university money. I relate this story not to explore the economic implications of creating dictionaries, but to suggest how the public actively reflects upon, engages with, and even contests the definitions found in dictionaries. As events have proven, Dr. Johnson was right to be concerned about how his *Dictionary* would be received—or at least about how individual definitions would be received. Despite his great erudition, his superb logic, and gift for conciseness—all energetically applied to the disclosure of meaning—not every definition would please everyone. Perhaps if Dr. Johnson had used the term “**humble** drudge” in his definition of *lexicographer*, the expression he employed in his “Preface” to the *Dictionary* instead of the “**harmless** drudge” in the *Dictionary* itself, his definition might have won approval or even

⁹ Adam Smith, “Review of *A Dictionary of the English Language* by Samuel Johnson,” *Edinburgh Review* 1 (June 1755): 61–63; reported in the *Scots Magazine* 17 (November 1755): 539–544; cited in Reddick, *The Making*, 83.

¹⁰ See his *Character of Mr. Johnson’s English Dictionary*, published with *A Letter . . . to Mr. Maxwell* (1755) described in Gertrude E. Noyes, “The Critical Reception of Johnson’s *Dictionary* in the Latter Eighteenth Century,” *Modern Philology* 52 (1955): 181; cited in Reddick, *The Making*, 84; “quixotic” is Noyes’ term.

gone unremarked. However, in this particular example, the university administrator tested Johnson's definition against the reality he knew and found it inaccurate. Although Johnson's *Dictionary* was "executed with the greatest labour and judgement,"¹¹ its definitions to this day continue to invite vigorous responses.

This should not surprise us. The heart of a dictionary is its display of senses, the array of meanings which its words carry through time. For Sir James Murray, Chief Editor of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the act of defining was the "real work," an assessment with which all practicing lexicographers would concur. Despite the centrality of this endeavor, there are no ordained rules for defining, no ready prescriptions for describing the compass of a word. The philological revolution of the nineteenth century clearly felt the influence of Franz Passow's 1819 dictum that "every word should be made to tell its own story,"¹² a principle which claims a seemingly objective narrative for every word in the language. From this follows the optimistic belief that if lexicographers are patient enough and careful enough, they will discover through empirical evidence the meaning(s) of the word with which they are preoccupied,¹³ and that they will record them without subjective bias. The fact that the evidence is now digitized and searchable only heightens the expectation of scientific rigor and of equally scientific results which would allow us to say the "real" meaning(s) of a word. This rhetoric, however, does not allow for the indeterminacy of some words, their slipperiness, their intractability, their openness to multiple interpretations. Nor does it recognize individual susceptibilities on the part of the word's biographer. Lynda Mugglestone has recently and superbly demonstrated that although lexicographic neutrality was one of the founding principles of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, "race, class, gender, as well as the prevalent images of correctness, all at times fractured the ideal of the impartial inventory of

¹¹ The Vice-Chancellor of Oxford's letter to the University requesting the awarding of an A.M. to Johnson, quoted in James Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill, rev. L. F. Powell, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934; reprtd. 1971), I, p. 280.

¹² In his revision of G. Schneider's *Kritisches griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch*; cited in Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon Based on the German Work of Francis Passow* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1858), xx.

¹³ Herbert Pilch makes the same point about the naive belief in the 'discovery' of meaning in "Lexical Indeterminacy," in *Words for Robert Burchfield's Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. Eric G. Stanley and T. F. Hoad (Woodbridge: Brewer, 1988), 133.

words.”¹⁴ While I believe these may not be the dominant issues which affect the *Dictionary of Old English* (DOE), there are no doubt other issues, of which we are not consciously aware, which may bias our treatment of language. For each dictionary is a product of its age. One clear marker that sets the DOE off as a twenty-first-century production, apart from its use of technology, is editorial reluctance to claim more than the evidence allows. Simultaneously, we editors try to be transparent about our areas of doubt, signalling them by question marks or tentative wording. To some this may appear as admirable scholarship; to others, an obvious failure to make a commitment; and to others, even worse, a total abdication of authority.

In the present essay I would like to focus on this interplay between sense and sensibility, between meaning and lexicographic engagement. Roberta Frank has recently shown us how a sensitivity to poetic understatement can help solve linguistic puzzles.¹⁵ Eric Stanley has lately argued how necessary, but difficult, it is for the translator of Old English to be attuned to the nuances of the language.¹⁶ On the other hand, Fred Robinson cautions the lexicographer from slipping

unawares into the role of literary interpreter, recording a meaning for a word not on the basis of lexicographical evidence but purely because his particular critical interpretation of the passage requires such a meaning. Scholars who then encounter his judgments in the dictionary often fail to distinguish between what is lexicographical fact and what is the dictionary-maker's momentary indulgence in literary criticism.¹⁷

As he is quick to point out, his warning is not “against versatile lexicographers” who also double “as men of letters” but “against subconscious confusion of the two.” Robinson's point is an important

¹⁴ *Lost for Words: The Hidden History of the 'Oxford English Dictionary'* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), xxi. See especially chapter 5 “I am not the Editor of the English Language,” 143–178. For a perceptive review of Mugglestone's impressive book, see Dorothy Haines in *Notes and Queries* 53 (2006): 222–224.

¹⁵ Roberta Frank, “The Incomparable Wryness of Old English Poetry,” in *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. John Walmsley (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 59–73, at 70, referring to lines 449–450 of *Solomon and Saturn*.

¹⁶ Eric G. Stanley, “Judgement Day: Hopes, Joys, and Sorrows in Medieval England,” *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 3rd series, vol. 5, ed. Roger Dahood and Peter E. Medine (New York: AMS Press, 2008), 1–53; I am grateful to Prof. Stanley for allowing me to read a prepublication copy of this essay.

¹⁷ Fred C. Robinson, “Lexicography and Literary Criticism: A Caveat,” in *Philological Essays: Studies in Old and Middle English Language and Literature in Honour of Herbert Dean Meritt*, ed. James L. Rosier (The Hague: Mouton, 1970), 99–110, at 99.

one. Sometimes a particular interpretation may appear beguilingly attractive to us. This is the very moment when the lexicographer must resist, pull back, and show a healthy scepticism as she re-examines the evidence. Complicating matters are dictional expectations as we define words from different fields of discourse and use labels to distinguish them: “in poetry,” “ecclesiastical,” “legal,” “medical,” “grammatical,” etc. As any one of the editors at the *DOE* will confirm, there is always a delicate balancing act between a careful assessment of the evidence and a literary sensitivity to the varying nuances of language.

I would like to begin with an overview of the letter *G*,¹⁸ the eighth letter of the *DOE*, recently published online, on CD-ROM and on microfiche.¹⁹ I will then focus on three words: the verb *gān* ‘to go’ and the main issues surrounding the writing of this entry; an abstract noun, spelled *gramfærnys*, the form of which was problematic and, therefore, its meaning; and, finally, a poetic compound, *sīpgearu*, the second element of which is formed on a *G* adjective, *gearu* ‘ready,’ and for which the *DOE* is proposing a meaning not found in the existing dictionaries. Prof. Matti Kilpiö, to whom this essay is dedicated, understands more than many historians of the English language some of the challenges that lexicographers face. Having magnanimously volunteered to write the verbs *bēon* ‘to be’ and *habban* ‘to have; hold’ for the *DOE*, he has had to contend with the high frequencies and grammatical complexi-

¹⁸ The writing of the letter *G* has been supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada; the Canada Foundation for Innovation through the TAPoR project; the National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, an independent federal agency; the British Academy; the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation, New York; the Early English Text Society, Oxford; the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York; the Salamander Foundation, Toronto; the Salus Mundi Foundation, Tucson; the Triangle Community Foundation, Raleigh; the Provost’s Office, the Office of the Dean of Arts and Science, and the Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto; and the various contributors to the *DOE* Fundraising Campaign, organized by Prof. Jane Toswell, University of Western Ontario, to meet the Mellon Challenge.

¹⁹ *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* online, ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey, *et al.* with web interface by Peter Mielke and Xin Xiang (Toronto: *DOE* project, 2007), <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>>; *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* on CD-ROM, ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey, *et al.*, with electronic version for Windows developed by Xin Xiang (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies for the *DOE* Project, 2008); *Dictionary of Old English: G* on microfiche, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey, Joan Holland, Dorothy Haines, David McDougall, Ian McDougall, with the assistance of Nancy Speirs and Pauline Thompson (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies for the *DOE* Project, 2008).

ties that surround these function words of the language. As a heartfelt token of gratitude for his tireless and devoted labor on behalf of the *DOE*, I offer him this study, especially of the verb *gān*.

G is a letter of middling size, not as big as S, the largest letter in the Old English (as well as in the Modern English) alphabet with approximately 3800 headwords, nor the second largest letter H, with about 3600 headwords, on which we are presently engaged. Nor is it as slight as the smallest letters, I, P, and Y, each with about 500 headwords. G is about average size with 1319 headwords. As is apparent from this headword count, the *ge*-prefixed forms in the *Dictionary of Old English* are not filed under G, as they all are in Bosworth-Toller-Campbell,²⁰ but are treated throughout the entire alphabet, filed under the first letter of their stem. So, for example, *ge-beran* 'to carry' is alphabetized under B and follows its simplex *beran*, and *ge-etan* 'to eat' is alphabetized under E and follows its simplex *etan*. Fortunately, this filing system has the virtue of saving us from the gargantuan task of writing nearly the entire dictionary under the letter G. But this was not the reason why we chose this system of alphabetization at the start of the project; rather we thought that by placing the simplex and its *ge*-compound next to each other, we could display their relationship more clearly for the reader. Perhaps what is even more useful, a reader can now discern almost immediately whether a simplex has a *ge*-compound or not.

The *DOE* is one of the few dictionaries of any language based on a comprehensive examination of the surviving evidence because of its Electronic Corpus. This thorough look at the primary materials enables the Toronto lexicographers to find new words, discover new meanings for words previously catalogued, and find additional attestations of rare meanings. Some of the new words discovered in G which presented no problems in meaning are: *gāstlicnes* 'spirituality,' from an anonymous homily for Sunday in *Rogationtide*, which now joins *gāstedōm* with the same meaning; *geōmrungdæg* 'day of lamentation,' describing Judgement Day, a new compound for the *geōmrung* word-family, a group characterized by audible sorrow, just as Eric Stanley

²⁰ *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of Joseph Bosworth*, ed. T. Northcote Toller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1882–98); T. N. Toller, ed. *Supplement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1908–21); Alistair Campbell, ed. *Enlarged Addenda and Corrigenda to the Supplement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972).

has recently argued for *gnorn* 'sorrow' and related words;²¹ it is apparently an exact synonym for *hēofungdæg*, also 'day of lamentation;' *ge-grēting* 'greeting, salutation' from a variant MS (CCCC 303) of Ælfric's Homily on the Annunciation, providing evidence for the prefixed form of the simplex *grēting* with the same meaning; and *grimian* 'to roar (of a lion),' a weak 2 verb related to the strong 3 verb *grimman* 'to rage, vent fury.' There are other pleasant surprises, such as the figurative use of the noun *gælsa*² 'glutton.' The Old English phrase *weorces gælsa* 'glutton for work,' i.e. 'one excessively fond of work,' anticipates by at least six hundred years the *OED*'s earliest figurative citation under the noun 'glutton,' a word adopted from Old French.²² As we create more sophisticated search tools to mine this data in the *DOE*, we hope the *Dictionary* itself will become an even more useful research tool for illuminating the earliest forms of English.

Henry Bradley, who was responsible for editing the letters *F* and *G* for Volume 4 of the *OED*, reflected modestly in his 'Prefatory Note to *G*' in October 1900 on the challenges he faced in writing that letter: "...*G* is unusually rich in those words of the primitive Teutonic [i.e. native English and Scandinavian] vocabulary, which express conceptions of the widest possible generality, and have developed an enormous number of specific applications."²³ The editors of the *DOE* would undoubtedly agree with his depiction of the letter. The specific words Bradley cites as requiring unusually long entries to illustrate the different usages are: the verbs 'get,' 'give,' 'go,' and 'grow,' the adjectives 'good' and 'great,' and nouns like 'ground.' We were luckily spared treating the verb 'to get' in the *Dictionary of Old English*, for although the root *-gytan* exists in the earliest period, it appears only in compounds, such as *a-*, *be-*, *for-*, *ofer-*, *on-*, *under-gytan*. The verb 'to get' as a simplex does not enter the language till about 1200 from Old Norse *geta*, with the earliest quotation in both the *MED* (*gēten* v. [1] sense

²¹ Stanley, "Judgement Day," 29–30.

²² *OED2* *glutton* n. and a. sense A.2.a: 'One who is inordinately fond of some specified object or pursuit, esp. **a glutton of books**, after L. *helluo librorum*. Also const. *for*.' The *OED2*'s first citation in this sense is dated 1704; the first citation of the specific phrase 'glutton for work' is dated by the *OED* as 1895 from Rudyard Kipling's *Day's Work*: 'He's honest, and a glutton for work.'

²³ All quotations of the prefaces in the *OED* are taken from Darrell R. Raymond, *Dispatches from the Front: The Prefaces to the 'Oxford English Dictionary'* (Waterloo, Ontario: University of Waterloo Centre for the New Oxford English Dictionary, 1987).

1.a) and the *OED* (*get* v. sense 1.a) taken from *The Ormulum*. Other 'Teutonic' words he mentions as interesting because of their sense development (and that usually leads to a significant amount of space) are: 'gall,' 'game,' 'gear,' 'ghost,' 'glass,' 'gloom,' 'glow,' 'God,' 'gold,' 'green,' 'grey,' and 'grim.' Of this group, only 'gear' is not from Old English, coming into the language about 1300, from Old Norse *gervi*, in the collective singular sense 'apparel, attire, dress.'²⁴ Although the remaining Old English words will not show as full a range of senses as Bradley's Modern English reflexes, nevertheless even in the earliest period there is sufficient complexity in the sense development of at least some of them to pose thorny problems for the lexicographer.

Bradley was accurate in noting the verb 'to go' as one of several requiring an extraordinary number of senses. Reading his entry today, we see only the final product of what was subject apparently to a number of reductions in sense divisions and citations, for Murray's comments, as Chief Editor, on Bradley's first draft of the 'go' entry were fierce: "Absolute folly, a waste of space," "absolutely superfluous," "too trivial and obvious," "not wanted."²⁵ When I mentioned to the *DOE* editor who wrote the entry for 'to go' Murray's ruthless editing of Bradley's work, he expressed the wish to see Bradley's original entry, for he thought that the entry as published in the *OED* did not fully account for the word's semantic and syntactic reach—an entry which even after Murray's drastic editing displays eight branches with ninety-six senses. In this instance, Bradley's fuller draft may have been preferable. However, the early history of the *OED* narrates the struggle between Murray's need for increased editorial productivity together with compression of entry-size, and Bradley's inability to compromise his meticulous scholarship or move faster through the material. Volume IV obviously proved to be a real testing-ground, for Murray wrote to one of the Delegates of Oxford University Press out of anxious frustration: "the scale to which it is done is entirely opposed to my wishes as Editor-in-chief...I desire to wash my hands entirely of Vol. IV."²⁶

²⁴ *MED* *gēre* n. sense 1. a; *OED2* *gear* noun sense 1.1.a.

²⁵ Mugglestone, *Lost for Words*, xvi.

²⁶ Mugglestone, *Lost for Words*, 25, 30–31; quotation is from 31 where Mugglestone cites from the Murray Papers/27/1/96: Draft of a letter from J.A.H. Murray to P.L. Gell, 27 January 1896.

With electronic publishing, economies of scale, which loomed so large for Murray, are not a major issue at the *DOE*. Yet, the hard work of defining remains the constant, the link which binds previous lexicographic generations to the present. Bradley's experience in writing the verb 'to go' parallels our own. This verb, with approximately 3700 occurrences, has been the single most complex entry written so far by the *DOE* staff. The difficulty lies in two directions: first, 'to go' involved an examination of nearly every prepositional adverb in the language, e.g., 'to go in / out / up / down / through / around / along / by,' etc; and second, within each of these phrasal uses there are many different senses. The same holds true for the verb *gangan* 'to go,' but with less frequency, occurring only approximately 1200 times. Dieter Kastovsky's 'selected list of compounds and derivatives' of these two verbs in the *Cambridge History of the English Language*²⁷ suggests the associative reach of the verb *gān* and its synonym *gangan*. His list records eighteen compounds formed on *gān* (§5.1.3.1 [5.a-r]). In addition to these eighteen full-status verbs, the *DOE* records in the 'See also' field a number of additional compounds, including quasi-compounds, usually element-by-element glosses of Latin verbs, such as *ābūtan~gān* glossing *circumire* 'to go round (a place);' *beforan~gān* glossing *praeire* / *praecedere* 'to go before, in front;' *binnan~gān* glossing *introire* 'to go in, enter.' Among the other basic verbs of motion which have appeared to date in the *DOE*, none, including *faran*, a strong class 6 verb and *fēran*, a weak class 1 verb, possesses the same level of complexity as *gān*, although they are naturally competing with *gān* for some of the same semantic space.²⁸

Like Bradley we have divided 'to go' into branches and main senses. The *DOE* has six branches in contrast with Bradley's eight, omitting his Branch IV, described as quasi-transitive with a pronoun as object, such as is found in the Modern English phrase 'to go it alone;' his Branch V, where he details special uses of the participles; and his Branch VIII where he lists phraseological combinations formed on

²⁷ Dieter Kastovsky, "Semantics and Vocabulary," in *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume 1: Beginnings to 1066*, ed. Richard Hogg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 294–296.

²⁸ The *faran* and *fēran* entries in the *DOE* were written by Prof. Michiko Ogura, Chiba University; see Michiko Ogura, *Verbs in Medieval English: Differences in Verb Choices in Verse and Prose*, Topics in English Linguistics 17 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996), 50–59, for her analysis of 'conflicts' among native verbs of motion.

the verbal stem, such as the adjectival 'go-as-you-please' (of a race, proceedings, etc.), 'go-at-it' meaning 'full of dash,' etc. We had no evidence in Old English for any of these later constructions. In the *DOE* the six main branches of *gān*, partially based on the *OED*'s *go*, are the following:

- I. Of movement, irrespective of the point of departure or destination
- II. Where movement from a place / thing / person is the primary notion
- III. Where destination or direction is the primary notion (further broken down)
 - III. A. Of self-originated movement or action
 - III. B. Of passive movement, change of state, etc.
- IV. Of movement towards the speaker: to come; *gan to* 'to come to (someone / something);' *ongean gan* 'to come towards / come to meet / approach (someone);' *gan her / hider* 'to come here / hither'
- V. Where the infinitive *gan* is used with an adverb or preposition and a form of *cuman* to express action accompanying hitherward motion (e.g., *com forþ gan* 'came forward to go / came forward and went (to a place);' *com in gan* 'came in to go / came in and went (to do something);' *comon gan ongean* 'came walking / advancing towards (someone);' etc. There are only six citations in this major branch, but we thought that it was an important enough construction that it deserved high status.
- VI. Special uses with prepositions / adverbs

This last category constitutes the largest branch in the entry, containing twenty-four main senses (and numerous sub-senses), proceeding alphabetically from *gan abutan* to *gan ymb(e)*. Our entry-writer thought at first that it would be possible to integrate these special uses, many of them idiomatic expressions, into the other five main branches, and in fact he tried; however, he quickly discovered that this was a forlorn hope, not only because of the number of citations but also because of their complexity. Not all of them could fit into the other branches, and once he decided that he would need this sixth branch for the spillover, it was more efficient to treat all the special uses there in one place rather than disperse them throughout the entry. Take, for example,

the use of the phrase *gan togædere* / *togædere gan* which constitutes a mini-entry in itself. The *DOE* identifies this one phrase as having six distinct senses:

VI.18. *gan togædere, togædere gan*

VI.18.a. of a group: to come together, convene, meet, assemble

VI.18.b. of one's enemies: to band / conspire together

VI.18.c. of combatants: to join battle

VI.18.d. of boundaries: to come together, meet, converge, coincide

VI.18.e. of a wound: to close

VI.18.f. of a settlement / pact / agreement: to be compounded / reached / concluded

None of these definitions is found in Bosworth-Toller-Campbell, nor is any of them found in the *OED* even though it treats the phrase 'go together' under its branch VII, and lists other idiomatic modern uses, such as 'to go together' in the sense of 'to keep company as lovers' or 'to go steady' i.e. 'to be dating exclusively' (*OED2* go sense VII.94.d). The *DOE's* fresh look at the Old English material has allowed us to examine the evidence systematically and record meanings not found in the other historical dictionaries of English. These discoveries, of course, are largely dependent upon the attentiveness and sensitivity of the entry-writer to the nuances of the language. Three of the idioms in the *DOE* describe the convergence of individuals: of a (neutral) group of people, it means 'to come together, convene, meet, assemble' such as when the *witan*, i.e. archbishops, bishops, abbots, and the chief men of the kingdom, *come together* in Charter I William to render judgement on a particular case;²⁹ of the coming together of one's enemies, it means 'to band / conspire together,' such as David's enemies do in the Paris Psalter when they *conspire together* "on anre gepeaht" ('with one purpose / design / intention');³⁰ of the coming together of combatants,

²⁹ Ch IWM (Douglas 7) 39: þa wa heora beigra tala & þæs abbodes gewitnesse gehyrd hæfdon þa behead ic him eallum þe ðær æt wæron þis gehyrende þat hi rihtne dom dæmdan æfter heora beigra tale; ða **eodon** þa witan togædere to þam dome se ercebiscop Lanfram of Cantwarabyrig & Thomas arcebiscop of Eoferwic... & maniga oðra biscopas & abbodas... & ealle þa heafodmenn ures rices gedæmdan þat swilc ealderdom & swylcere stowe freodom scolde fullwunian æfre unawemmed & stapolfæst oð worulda geendunge.

³⁰ PPs 70.9: oft me feala cwædon feondas yfele, and sætendan sawle minre and on anre gepeaht **eodan** togædere (*qui custodiebant animam meam consilium fecerunt in unum*).

it means 'to join battle,' such as when the English army *joins battle* with the Danes as recorded in the C, D, E and F-texts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for the year 993, when the English leaders ignominiously are the first in flight.³¹ The remaining three idiomatic expressions refer to coincidence or closure of various sorts: of boundaries, it means 'to come together, meet, converge, coincide,' such as when boundary lines are said to *converge* in the descriptions of various property lines in specific Old English charters;³² of a wound, the phrase 'to go together' means simply 'to close,' as when the therapeutic properties of the centaury plant allows wounds to *close* quickly;³³ finally, when referring to a settlement / pact / agreement, 'to go together' means 'to be compounded / reached / concluded' as in the E-text of the Chronicle for the year 1091 when an agreement *is reached* between King William and the Duke of Normandy about property in France.³⁴ I have written elsewhere how shifts in application can be a productive source of polysemy among various word classes, particularly adjectives.³⁵ Here, we see this same productivity with a verb phrase. Although *gan togædere* means 'to come together' in one way or another in each of these various applications, it is the noun subject which determines the precise coloring, giving exactitude to the verb phrase. And so, we come to view each of these applications as discrete senses.

If we were to integrate these phrasal expressions with *gan togædere* into the previously mentioned six main branches, we could have treated some of them under category III, 'where destination or direction is the primary notion.' However, we would have had to divide them between the sub-categories A and B; the assemblies of peoples

³¹ ChronC 993.4: þa gegaderede man swiðe micle fyrde, & þa hi togædere **gan** sceoldon, þa onstealdan þa heretogan ærest þone fleam (D *togadre gan sceoldon*, E *togædere gan sceoldan*, F *togedere gan scoldan*; cf. F [Lat.]: *cum conuenire deberent*).

³² For example, Ch 772 (Birch 1229) 3: be fenne on þone heafodæcer oþ þone lytlan hlaw, þonon to þære apuldre þær þa þreo landgemæru togædere **gaþ**.

³³ Lch I (Herb) 35.2: ðeos sylfe wyrnt *centauria* ys swyþe scearpnumul niwe wunda & wide to gehælenne swa þæt þa wunda hrædlice togædere **gað**. & eac swa some heo gedep þæt flæsc togædere geclifað gyf hyt man on þam wætere gesygd þe heo on bið (cf. Ca: *herba centauria efficax est ad plagas glutinandas, ut etiam carnes cohaerescant, quae ex aqua eius coquantur*).

³⁴ ChronE 1091.4: onmang þam þe he þær wæs, heora sehte togædere **eode** on þet Gerard þet se eorl him to handan let Uescam & þone eorldom æt Ou & Kiæresburh.

³⁵ Antonette diPaolo Healey, "Straining Words and Striving Voices: Polysemy and Ambiguity and the Importance of Context in the Disclosure of Meaning," in *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. John Walmsley (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 74–90, at 79–81.

(whether neutral groups, enemies, or combatants) would have been classified under A 'of self-originated movement;' the meeting of boundaries, however, would have been classified under B, 'of passive movement, change of state, etc.' The closing of a wound and the reaching of an agreement, however, are harder to fit within the existing classifications and are so idiomatic that the *DOE* entry-writer did not attempt it. No doubt because of dilemmas like this, lexicographers of English, from Dr. Johnson on, have treated the special uses of the verb 'to go' with prepositions and adverbs as a separate category at the end of the entry. The *DOE* has followed this pragmatic lexicographic tradition, driven to it by the vagaries and idiosyncracies of the language. These adverbs and prepositions collocating with *gān* are approaching the status of the separable prefixes in German but, as we know, in English they develop as phrasal verbs. Also, like earlier lexicographers, we have grouped these idiomatic phrases alphabetically; however, this may simply be a nod to the conventions of the past, for in this age of electronic dictionaries any order is searchable.

I have used this example of *gan togædere* to suggest the nature of some of the problems we faced in writing the verb 'to go': getting control of the material and deciding what was significant; recognizing and then recording previously uncharted meanings; deciding upon the most appropriate placement of individual senses (whether they should be integrated into the logical structure of the entry or treated as idioms at the end of the entry); noting other senses within this long entry which ought to be compared or other senses of other verbs which justify comparison, etc. When I asked my colleague who wrote the entry for *gān* what he thought was the most important thing about it, he said that 'it was finished' and that we actually had a *gān* entry for the *DOE*. No doubt there were moments when he must have despaired of imposing any kind of order upon this material. But now having concluded his heroic task, and looking forward to the future, he knew with all the knowledge that hard labor brings that the *gān* entry would be invaluable to us as we define the *gān* compounds later in the alphabet.

Not all of our lexical problems involve words of high frequency. Sometimes *hapax legomena* can be equally, if not more, troublesome. Such was the case with one of the compounds, spelled *gramfærnys*, in the *gram* 'angry' word-family. This is a relatively compact family, consisting of fourteen words: the principal adjective *gram* 'angry,

wrathful; hostile, fierce;’ its cognate noun, *grama*¹ ‘rage, anger, wrath;’ the adverbs *grame* and *gramlice* ‘fiercely, cruelly; angrily; severely;’ the weak 2 verb *gramian* ‘to anger, vex (someone); to burn with anger;’ and the various compounds formed from them: the adjectives *æfen-gram* ‘fierce or angry in the evening,’ an appropriate depiction of Grendel on his nocturnal raids; *gram-bære* ‘angry; fierce; passionate,’ occurring ten times and exclusively in the *Pastoral Care*; *gramlic* ‘fierce, cruel; wrathful’ occurring mainly in Ælfric; and four compound adjectives which specify the internal space where the anger resides: *gram-heort* ‘fierce / hostile in heart / mind;’ *gram-hycgende* and *gram-hȳdig* ‘having hostile thought / purpose’ and *gram-mōd* ‘of fierce disposition;’ two nouns: *gram-word* ‘hostile word / speech / utterance’ and *nīþ-grama* ‘malicious anger;’ and finally the problematic *gramfærnys*.

This form occurs only in a text for the *Use of Confessors* from Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 190, in Part B of the MS dated by Neil Ker as the middle or second half of the eleventh century.³⁶ The citation appears in the DOE as the following: Conf 10.1 60: ælc gramfærnys cymð of deofle & ælc geflit & ælc ungelimp, þonne uton wiðstandan him & lipegian ure mod (‘each *gramfærnys* comes from the devil and each discord and each mishap; then let us withstand him and calm our minds’). We were initially unsure what the form meant and therefore were undecided under what headword we should treat the spelling *gramfærnys*. To some, the manuscript reading, clearly *gramfærnys*, is defensible.³⁷ Bosworth used the manuscript spelling as his headword spelling and defined the word simply as ‘anger, fury’ without suggesting how the form arose or what the second element *færnys* might mean. One of our specialist readers, who also supported the manuscript reading, thought the compound was formed from *gram* ‘angry’ + *fær* ‘(sudden) attack’ + the abstract suffix, the compound presumably meaning ‘fierce or hostile (sudden) attack.’ The difficulty with this suggestion is that nowhere else in Old English is a compound formed from an adjective + *fær* + *nes*. In the entire *fær* word-family, with its thirty-five compounds, *fær* exists only as a first element.³⁸ It is never preceded

³⁶ N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), no. 45: s.xi med., xi², art. 11.

³⁷ CCCC 190, p. 415/22.

³⁸ The compounds are the following: *fær-ærning*, *-blæd*, *-bryne*, *-copu*, *-cumen*, *-cwealm*, *-cyle*, *-dēap*, *-dryre*, *-fyll*, *-gripe*, *-gryre*, *-haga*, *-lic*, *-lice*, *-nes*, *-nīþ*, *-ræs*, *-ræsende*, *-sceapa*, *-scyte*, *-searu*, *-sēap*, *-slide*, *-spell*, *-spring*, *-steorfa*, *-stice*, *-swige*, *-swyle*, *-untrunnes*, *-wundor*; **færbrægd*, **færclam*, **færstyltnes*.

by an adjective or any other part of speech. If the *DOE* were to create a headword *gramfēernes*, we would also be creating a new type of compound previously unattested for the *fēer* word-family. While this particular instance possibly could be the sole example of a compound of this type, we were reluctant to elevate it to the status of a headword if there were a better alternative. Apparently Toller had similar reservations about the manuscript spelling, perhaps taking it, as we do, as a transmission error. His solution, which we have followed, was to create the headword *grambāernes*. This makes good morphological sense to us, supported within the *gram* word-family by the compound adjective *grambāere* ‘angry,’ as well as in Old English generally by other formations of this type, such as *cwealmbāernes* ‘destruction,’ *dēapbāernes* ‘pestilence,’ *lustbāernes* ‘desire,’ *wæstmbāernes* ‘fertility’ (from the adjectival *cwealmbāere*, *dēapbāere*, *lustbāere*, *wæstmbāere* + *-nes*).³⁹ *Grambāernes*, which we have defined as ‘(fit of) anger, bad temper,’ also makes specific contextual sense where bad temper and discord are immediately juxtaposed. We would translate the citation this way: ‘each (fit of) anger and each discord and each mishap comes from the devil; then let us withstand him and calm our minds.’ In this example the *DOE* through a re-examination of the evidence has confirmed an interpretation originally advanced by Toller. Our bias, like Toller’s, was against the manuscript reading and in favor of a more typical morphological paradigm. Nevertheless, the actual reading of the MS appears in the attested spellings section of the entry with the addition of a parenthetical editorial comment: “(prob. for *grambær-nys*).” And we signal uncertainty about the headword by placing a question mark in front of it.

In my next example, again a hapax legomenon, the *DOE* advances a new interpretation for a compound formed on the adjective *-gearu* ‘ready,’ the adjective *sīþgearu*. It is found in a late poem of 264 lines whose MS is dated to the second half of the twelfth century,⁴⁰ and imaginatively titled “Instructions for Christians” by its first editor. Few have found the poem of interest if the paucity of bibliographic references is a valid indication. It has been edited three times: by

³⁹ Kastovsky, “Semantics and Vocabulary,” §5.4.4.3, regards formations with *-bāere* as derivatives rather than genuine compounds, classifying *-bāere* as a suffixoid.

⁴⁰ Corpus Christi College MS li.1.33, fols. 224^v–7^r; Ker, *Catalogue*, No. 18, art. 44.

James Rosier in 1964,⁴¹ by Maria Grimaldi, with an Italian translation, in 1971,⁴² and by Susan Grinna Youngs in 1996 in an unpublished University of Wisconsin dissertation.⁴³ A facsimile of the poem appeared in 1991 in Volume 23 of the series *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*, edited by Fred Robinson and Eric Stanley.⁴⁴ Greenfield and Calder in their survey of Old English literature describe the poem as a "collection of moral and religious apothegms,"⁴⁵ and Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, averting to it incidentally in a much larger discussion of heroic values and Christian ethics, classifies it as a "collection of religious aphorisms."⁴⁶ Peter Clemoes mentions it as a "collection of forty-one sententious statements in verse, mostly maxims and injunctions," briefly alluding to its bold proclamation that wealth was not necessarily sinful.⁴⁷ And almost as if ringing the death knell to any serious consideration of the poem, Jackson J. Campbell criticizes the poem's ending for its lack of distinctiveness and its wide applicability to any number of Old English poems, viewing such standard closures as "mechanical, hackneyed, and extraneous to the poem."⁴⁸ Yet the poem is not without its literary and linguistic interests, and *siþgearu* is one of them. The compound is found in the following maxim: Instr 163: ne scealt þu beon to sene ne to siðgeare, ne to slapor ne to slaw, gif þu sigedryhten mid cræfte on gecampe gecweman þæncest ('you

⁴¹ James L. Rosier, " 'Instructions for Christians,' a Poem in Old English," *Anglia* 82 (1964): 4–22; "Addenda to 'Instructions for Christians,'" *Anglia* 84 (1966): 74; further supplemented by Fred C. Robinson, "Notes and Emendations to Old English Poetic Texts," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 67 (1966): 356–364, at 360–362; and Roland Torkar, "Textkritische Anmerkungen zum AE Gedicht 'Instructions for Christians,'" *Anglia* 89 (1971): 164–177.

⁴² Maria Grimaldi, "Precetti per i Cristiani," *AION, filologia germanica* 22 (1979): 59–78.

⁴³ Susan Grinna Youngs, "A New Edition of 'Instructions for Christians': C.U.L. MS II.1.33" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1996).

⁴⁴ Fred C. Robinson and Eric G. Stanley, ed., *Old English Verse Texts from Many Sources: A Comprehensive Collection*, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile* 23 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1991), item 35.1–7.

⁴⁵ Stanley B. Greenfield and Daniel G. Calder, *A New Critical History of Old English Literature, with a Survey of the Anglo-Latin Background by Michael Lapidge* (New York: New York University Press, 1986), 268.

⁴⁶ Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, "Heroic Values and Christian Ethics," in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 107–125, at 119.

⁴⁷ Peter Clemoes, *Interactions of Thought and Language in Old English Poetry*, *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England* 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 347.

⁴⁸ Jackson J. Campbell, "Ends and Meanings: Modes of Closure in Old English Poetry," *Medievalia et Humanistica* n.s. 16 (1988): 1–49, at 16.

must not be too slothful, nor too *siðgeare*, nor too sleepy nor too slow, if you think to please the victorious lord with skill in battle'). The problem lies with the meaning of the first element *sið*. Rosier, apparently influenced by *Guthlac* 1175, "beo ðu on siþ gearu" ('be ready for a journey'), interpreted the compound as 'eager for travel,' taking *siþ* as the noun 'journey.' However, since this definition is neutral and the three other alliterating adjectives, *sene*, *slapor*, *slaw*, are negative, Rosier obviously felt he had to offer an interpretive explanation of 'eager for travel,' and he adds the clarifying gloss 'impatient' in his note to line 163. Rosier's definition has fixed the critical reception of the passage, for Grimaldi's translation of the word in her edition is *troppo impaziente* 'too impatient.' Alistair Campbell, the only lexicographer to record the word, repeats Rosier's definition with slight variation, 'ready for travel' (s.v. *siþgearu*) but without the interpretive gloss. Youngs, however, in her analysis of this line in her dissertation makes a much better suggestion, considering *siþ* as the adverb 'late' and not as the noun 'journey.'⁴⁹ But she takes what we consider to be the second element of the compound as an "unnecessary later addition" and emends it away. I would like to take her second point first, that *geare* is an addition to the original text, because it is "crowded" into the line, runs into the right boundary line and appears to be in darker ink.⁵⁰ From the facsimile published by Robinson and Stanley of folio 226v of Corpus Christi College Cambridge Ii.1.33, it is evident that there are a number of lines, and not just the line which ends with *geare*, which run into the margin: line 6 *forð*, line 7 *nawiht*, line 8 *onfon æt*, line 9 *driht* of *drihtnes*, etc. Several other words on this folio also appear to be in slightly darker ink: line 6 *fulfæstlice* and *forð*, line 14 *earnungum*, but all are in the original hand. Therefore, in the absence of clear evidence to the contrary, we believe *geare* is an integral part of the poem, written by the original scribe, and should not be radically deleted. We agree with Youngs, however, that *siþ* is better translated as 'late.' In fact, we think it may function just as its opposite *æwr* 'early' does in the compound *æwrwacol* 'early awake'. Moreover, there is evidence of the adverb *siþ* in other compound formations: *siþdagas* 'later days,

⁴⁹ "A New Edition," 108.

⁵⁰ "A New Edition," 144–145 quoting 144.

later times' in *Elene* 638, another poetic text;⁵¹ *sīþboren* 'late-born,' found only as a gloss to *postfetans* 'late-bringing forth/ late-breeding,' a form which parallels the construction here with adverb plus adjective.⁵² In addition, the construction is clearly attested in other Germanic languages such as Old Norse where we find the compound *seingörr* 'slow-made, slow-growing,'⁵³ the second element of which is cognate with OE *gearu*. ON *seinbúinn*⁵⁴ and ODan *senfærdig*⁵⁵ 'late-ready' would be even closer parallels in sense to our word if we take *sīþ* as an adverb. If our interpretation is correct, the compound *sīþgearu* would mean literally 'late ready' i.e. 'sluggish,' and we would then have four adjectives, all alliterating, which suggest 'torpor': 'you must not be too slothful, nor too sluggish, nor too sleepy, nor too slow.' Now that Roberta Frank has taught us how to read understatement in Old English poetry,⁵⁶ we have the literary skills to interpret the passage. The poet is not suggesting that it is permissible to be occasionally dilatory, to have a little lie-down every now and again, but rather he is urging haste in pleasing the victorious lord, i.e. 'you must never be slothful, nor sluggish, nor sleepy, nor slow.'

Convincing as we find this interpretation, there is another possibility we need to consider: *sīþgearu* may not be a compound at all but simply two words, adverb + adjective, but with the same meaning as the compound. Taking it as two words would then parallel the adverb + adjective sequence, for example, in a maxim from the *Durham Proverbs*. The citation appears in the *DOE* as Dur Prov 23: ne sceal man to ær forht ne to ær fægen [*nec*] cito *pavidus* *nec* ilico [*arridens*] *qui esse debet* ('One ought not to be too early / soon afraid nor too early / soon rejoicing'). Meter does not resolve the question for us, for it makes

⁵¹ Ic on geogoðe wearð on **siðdagum** syððan acenned, cnihtgeong hæleð ('I came into my youth in later days, a young boy born later').

⁵² PsGLA 77.69: & geceas ðeow his & ahof hine of eowdum scea of ðæm **siðborenum** onfeng hine et elegit *dauid seruum suum et sustulit eum de gregibus ouium de postfetantes accepit eum* (B *siðborenum*, C *siðborynum*); HIGI D208: *de post fetantes æfter þon tuddorfostre l of þam siþborenum*.

⁵³ Richard Cleasby and Gudbrand Vigfusson, *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. William A. Craigie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957) s.v.

⁵⁴ Johan Fritzner, *Ordbog over Det gamle norske Sprog* (Oslo: Møller, 1954) s.v.

⁵⁵ Otto Kalkar, *Ordbog til det Ældre Danske Sprog 1300–1700* (Copenhagen: Thiel, 1881–1918; reprtd. Odense: Akademisk Forlag, 1976) s.v. I am grateful to my colleagues, David and Ian McDougall, for suggesting to me the ON and ODan parallels.

⁵⁶ Frank, "Incomparable Wryness," 59–73, esp. 70–71.

no difference to the scansion whether *siðgeare* is a compound or not. Either way the half-line scans as a C-type (x x ' ` x, drop, drop, lift, lift, drop), although Bliss would distinguish the line with the compound as light (his Type d2b).⁵⁷ Our problem, as lexicographers, is that we needed to deal with the form somewhere. As our expectations are quite different for poetry, where compounds are one of the most significant stylistic devices,⁵⁸ than for prose, and as "Instructions for Christians" is a poem, we decided to retain the poetic compound of its first editor Rosier. We were also concerned that this interesting citation from a late poem might be overlooked if we filed it under the more frequently occurring adjective *gearu* (450 occ.); however, if we treated it as a compound, the form would retain a certain prominence. One of the most frequent decisions we make at the project is where to file a word. As long as we signpost the alternative, if we think there is one, then we hope to have fulfilled our responsibility to our users. The definition for *siþgearu* appears in draft form in the *DOE* in the following way: sluggish (lit. 'late ready'; cf. *siþdagas* 'later times,' *siþboren* 'late born'), parallel to *sæne* with same sense; alternatively, take as two words; less plausibly, the first element has been taken as *siþ* noun 'journey' (cf. *siþfram* 'eager to depart') and the compound translated as 'ready to travel, impatient.'

As is evident, the *DOE* presents *siþgearu* with a different meaning from Rosier's ('eager for travel, impatient') and Campbell's ('ready for travel'). In our hierarchy of senses, we give what to us is the most compelling reading first, together with the evidence of parallel compounds for comparative purposes. Next, we offer the genuine possibility that the form may be considered as two words. Finally, we introduce Rosier's and Campbell's interpretations of the compound with the value judgement "less plausibly." Nevertheless, we adduce the evidence of the parallel formation *siþfram* 'eager to depart'⁵⁹ so that readers can make their own judgement with full knowledge.

⁵⁷ A. J. Bliss, *The Metre of 'Beowulf'* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1958), 124.

⁵⁸ Kastovsky, "Semantics and Vocabulary," §5.4.2.1.

⁵⁹ Beo 1813: Ond þa **siðfrome**, searwum gearwe wigend wæron; eode weorð Denum æþeling to yppan, þær se ofer wæs, hæle hildedeor Hroðgar grette; And 244: He ðær lidweardas, þrymlice þry þegnas <gemette>, modiglice menn, on merebate sittan **siðfrome**, swylce hie ofer sæ comon; And 640: Gastas hweorfon, sohton **siðfrome** swegles dreamas, engla eðel þurh þa æðelan miht; Fates 75: Næron ða twegen tohtan sæne, lindgelaces, land Persea sohton **siðfrome**, Simon ond Thaddeus, beornas beadorofe;

Each of the words analyzed here present dilemmas for the lexicographer. The verb *gān* is undoubtedly the most problematic, not so much because of its size, although that would have been understandable with its nearly 4000 occurrences, but because of the adverbs and prepositions with which it collocates. Many of these occurrences demanded separate sense distinctions in order to display the full range of usage. *Gān* demanded of the lexicographer both a willingness to let the evidence speak for itself and an attentiveness to record the varying meanings a single phrase like *gan togædere* may have. That phrase is paradigmatic of what occurred throughout the verb where many new senses have been revealed through the evidence of the citations. The particular sensibility that the *DOE* lexicographer brought to this verb was not to despair over the tangle of uses which required analysis, to see it through to the end, and to make of it something more complete than had previously existed. We hope that our treatment of *gān*, which is one of the backbones of the language, may prove helpful to the *OED* as it undergoes major revision. Our analysis of the spelling *gramfær-nys* suggests that morphology can be a helpful guide in understanding puzzling forms. Sometimes the characteristic structural features of the language should be given more weight than an individual manuscript reading. Our rethinking of the spelling, and placing it under the headword *grambærnes* '(fit of) anger,' just as Toller did, reconfirms the astute judgement of Toller for whom we have the greatest respect. Finally, our attempt to understand the adjective *sīþgearu* which we have defined as 'late ready' i.e. 'sluggish' reveals that we cannot borrow slavishly the definitions of the past, such as Rosier's 'eager for a journey' i.e. 'impatient,' simply because it is traditional, but each definition has to be rethought within its individual context. In finding the more appropriate definition, we marshal comparative material both from Old English and from the cognate Germanic languages. Particularly in this instance, the lexicographer's sensitivity to understatement as an important feature of Old English style helps her not only to understand the word *sīþgearu* but also the fuller meaning of the maxim in "Instructions for Christians."

As Dr. Johnson recognized, the "pursuit of perfection" is an elusive goal for a lexicographer. Bradley and Murray at the *OED* knew almost

GuthB 919 Hwylum mennisce aras eaðmedum eft neosedon, ond þær **siðfrome** on þam sigewonge æt þam halgan <þeowan> helpe gemetton, ferðþes frofre.

from the start that it was an impossible ideal, one constantly tempered by pragmatism, for constraints of time, money, and space serve as a refrain in that dictionary's history. At the *DOE*, even with the enabling technology of the twenty-first century, the task of defining is still the most demanding part of our work. To this task we bring whatever skills we have acquired, whatever knowledge we have gained, whatever sympathy we feel for these texts of a thousand years ago and more. We hope that will be enough.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ I am grateful to Eric Stanley for reading a draft of this paper, for helping with scansion and for improving infelicities of style.

Works Cited

- Bliss, A. J. 1958. *The Metre of 'Beowulf'*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Boswell, James. *Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill, rev. L. F. Powell, 6 vols. 1934; reprtd. 1971. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Burchfield, Robert. 1989. *Unlocking the English Language*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Cameron, Angus, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey *et al.*, eds. 2007. *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* online. Toronto: DOE project. <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>>.
- , eds. 2008. *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* on CD-ROM. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Campbell, Alistair, ed. 1972. *Enlarged Addenda and Corrigenda to the Supplement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, Jackson J. 1988. Ends and Meanings: Modes of Closure in Old English Poetry. *Medievalia et Humanistica* n.s. 16: 1–49.
- Cleasby, Richard and Gudbrand Vigfusson. 1957. *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. William A. Craigie. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Clemoes, Peter. 1995. *Interactions of Thought and Language in Old English Poetry*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eliot, T. S. 1962. East Coker II, Four Quartets. In *The Complete Poems and Plays: 1909–1950*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Frank, Roberta. 2006. The Incomparable Wryness of Old English Poetry. In *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. John Walmsley, 59–73. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fritzner, Johan. 1954. *Ordbog over Det gamle norske Sprog*. Oslo: Møller.
- Greenfield, Stanley B. and Daniel G. Calder. 1986. *A New Critical History of Old English Literature, with a Survey of the Anglo-Latin Background by Michael Lapidge*. New York: New York University Press.
- Grimaldi, Maria. 1979. Precetti per i Cristiani. *AION, filologia germanica* 22: 59–78.
- Haines, Dorothy. 2006. Review of Lynda Mugglestone, *Lost for Words: The Hidden History of the 'Oxford English Dictionary'* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005). *Notes and Queries* 53: 222–224.
- Healey, Antonette diPaolo. 2006. Straining Words and Striving Voices: Polysemy and Ambiguity and the Importance of Context in the Disclosure of Meaning. In *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. John Walmsley, 74–90. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Healey, Antonette diPaolo, Joan Holland, *et al.*, eds. 2008. *Dictionary of Old English: G* on microfiche. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Hitchings, Henry. 2005. *Dr Johnson's Dictionary: The Extraordinary Story of the Book that Defined the World*. London: John Murray.
- Johnson, Samuel. 1779. Preface. In *A Dictionary of the English Language in which the Words are deduced from their ORIGINALS, and ILLUSTRATED in their DIFFERENT SIGNIFICATIONS by EXAMPLES from the best WRITERS*, facsimile edition with a preface by R.W. Burchfield. London: Times Books.
- Kalkar, Otto. 1881–1918. *Ordbog til det Ældre Danske Sprog 1300–1700*. Copenhagen: Thiel; reprtd. Odense: Akademisk Forlag, 1976.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. 1992. Semantics and Vocabulary. In *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume 1: Beginnings to 1066*, ed. Richard Hogg, 290–408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ker, N. R. 1957. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. 1858. *A Greek-English Lexicon Based on the German Work of Francis Passow*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Mugglestone, Lynda. 2005. *Lost for Words: The Hidden History of the 'Oxford English Dictionary'*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ogura, Michiko. 1996. *Verbs in Medieval English: Differences in Verb Choices in Verse and Prose*, Topics in English Linguistics 17. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- O'Keeffe, Katherine O'Brien. 1991. Heroic Values and Christian Ethics. In *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge, 107–125. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pilch, Herbert. 1988. Lexical Indeterminacy. In *Words for Robert Burchfield's Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. Eric G. Stanley and T. F. Hoad, 107–125. Woodbridge: Brewer.
- Raymond, Darrell R. 1987. *Dispatches from the Front: The Prefaces to the 'Oxford English Dictionary'*. Waterloo, Ontario: University of Waterloo Centre for the New Oxford English Dictionary.
- Reddick, Allen. 1996. *The Making of Johnson's 'Dictionary': 1746–1773*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, Fred C. 1966. Notes and Emendations to Old English Poetic Texts. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 67: 356–364.
- . 1970. Lexicography and Literary Criticism: A Caveat. In *Philological Essays: Studies in Old and Middle English Language and Literature in Honour of Herbert Dean Meritt*, ed. James L. Rosier, 99–110. The Hague: Mouton.
- Robinson, Fred C. and Eric G. Stanley, ed. 1991. *Old English Verse Texts from Many Sources: A Comprehensive Collection*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 23. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger.
- Rosier, James L. 1964. "Instructions for Christians," a Poem in Old English. *Anglia* 82: 4–22.
- . 1966. Addenda to "Instructions for Christians." *Anglia* 84: 74.
- Stanley, Eric G. 2006. Review of Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language in which the WORDS are deduced from their ORIGINALS, and ILLUSTRATED in their DIFFERENT SIGNIFICATIONS by EXAMPLES from the best WRITERS* (Oakland, CA: Octavo Editions, 2005) on CD-ROM. *Notes and Queries* 53: 2.
- . 2008. Judgement Day: Hopes, Joys, and Sorrows in Medieval England. *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 5: 1–53.
- Toller, T. Northcote, ed. 1882–98. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of Joseph Bosworth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toller, T.N., ed. 1908–21. *Supplement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Torkar, Roland. 1971. Textkritische Anmerkungen zum AE Gedicht "Instructions for Christians." *Anglia* 89: 164–177.
- Youngs, Susan Grinna. 1996. A New Edition of "Instructions for Christians": C.U.L. MS II.1.33. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin.

SPATIAL UNDERSTANDING OF TIME IN EARLY GERMANIC
CULTURES: THE EVIDENCE OF OLD ENGLISH TIME
WORDS AND NORSE MYTHOLOGY

Lilla Kopár

The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

Old English has an elaborate lexical scheme to express the notion and measurement of time. Different time words and phrases highlight different aspects of time, such as short or long duration, a well-defined point in time, the time appointed for a certain action, or a period with a distinct beginning or end. Most of these words and expressions define time with the help of the time-space coordinates, which in itself is not surprising. Time is generally conceptualized metaphorically in physical terms, as if it had physical dimensions and were located in space.¹ The conceptual metaphor TIME IS SPACE provides a structure for understanding time and for describing it through language. The following study of select Old English time words suggests that in Anglo-Saxon England the concept of time was connected with a specific space, the house or hall, which adds a culture-specific aspect to this otherwise wide-spread conceptual metaphor. The intersection of temporal and spatial dimensions in the image of the hall is well illustrated by the use of the hall as a metaphor for human life by King Edwin's thane in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* (book two, chapter thirteen).² Lexical evidence further reveals that these

¹ Murray Knowles and Rosamund Moon, *Introducing Metaphor* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), 35; on the metaphorical nature of our ordinary conceptual system see George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2003 (1980)), 3–4.

² Bede, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, corrected reprint (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 182–185. There has been considerable amount of research on the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian hall as a metaphor for community, society, and the world, but little attention has been paid to the relationship between the hall and time. On various aspects of the hall as cultural metaphor see, among others, Kathryn Hume, "The Concept of the Hall in Old English Poetry," *Anglo-Saxon England* 3 (1974): 63–74; Jennifer Neville, *Representations of the Natural World in Old English Poetry*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 27 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 62–69, 146–147; Alvin A. Lee, *The Guest-Hall of Eden: Four Essays on the Design of Old*

temporal and spatial coordinates are supplemented by a third coordinate of 'action' and the three form an inseparable unity.

The objective of the present paper is twofold. On the one hand I will explore how time is conceptualized through structure, how temporal structure is reflected in language, and how that relates to physical space. First I will discuss competing medieval notions of the structure of time, which will be followed by an overview of the semantic field of "time" in Old English, in order to understand the place in the lexical spectrum of three specific words, Old English *fyrst*, *hwil*, and *fæc*, which constitute the linguistic evidence for my argument. On the other hand, since conceptual categories are embedded in culture and operate at a deeper level than their lexical realizations,³ in the second part of the paper I will investigate whether the concept of time as reflected in the lexical evidence can be attested outside of language. The findings of the lexical analysis are thus juxtaposed with evidence of a very different kind, namely that provided by Norse mythology. Norse myths offer an insight into traditional narratives of time relating to those that the Anglo-Saxons might have had. Such a comparison is justified by the close affinities between certain aspects of Anglo-Saxon and early medieval Scandinavian culture, as well as the common origin of the Anglo-Saxon and Norse cosmologies.⁴ The approach is of course tentative and the use of Norse mythological source material in an Anglo-Saxon context is somewhat problematic. Nonetheless, these narratives

English Poetry (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 24–26, 178–181; Hugh Magennis, *Images of Community in Old English Poetry*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 18 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 128–132; Paul Beekman Taylor, *Sharing Story: Medieval Norse-English Literary Relationships*, AMS Studies in the Middle Ages 25 (New York: AMS Press, 1998), 107–122; Lotte Hedeager, "Asgard Reconstructed? Gudme—a 'Central Place in the North'," in *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Mayke de Jong and Frans Theuvs with Carine van Rhijn, *The Transformation of the Roman World* 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 467–507, esp. 478–481.

³ Christian J. Kay, "Metaphors We Lived By: Pathways Between Old and Modern English," in *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy*, ed. Jane Roberts and Janet Nelson (London: King's College London and Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, 2000), 273–285, esp. 285.

⁴ As Alaric Hall has recently argued, for example, the early Anglo-Saxon conceptions of the relationships of human beings to mythological races were fundamentally similar to those attested in skaldic verse. See Alaric Hall, *Elves in Anglo-Saxon England. Matters of Belief, Health, Gender and Identity*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 8 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007).

may offer a way to explore how far language and culture overlap and provide non-linguistic evidence, however tentative, for a pre-Christian concept of time reflected in the Old English lexicon.⁵

The structure of time

In pre-modern Europe, time was a subjective and qualitative experience which constituted part of the human condition, rather than an objective and absolute chronology.⁶ It had a structure and was measured, but at the heart of its structure and measurement it reflected the life and experience of individuals and communities.

The people of the Middle Ages had no single notion of the overall structure of time. Time was perceived as simultaneously cyclical, linear, and figurative, that is, as a combination of three opposing yet co-existing temporal structures inherited from different cultural traditions.⁷ From a human perspective, the most natural and immediate perception of time is as a cyclical phenomenon. Everyday life is determined by a number of different temporal cycles (*cursus*), the predictability of which provides a routine and a feeling of security. The cyclical understanding of time is based on a rhythm of events which is repetitive and recursive, and thus predictable. The recurrence is not always well defined or regular in interval (e.g., the patterns of growth and decay, or rise and fall), but it is predictable in its content.⁸ There are three main types of temporal cycle: (1) the *natural cursus*, based on repetition in nature (e.g., day and night, or the seasons); (2) the *cursus of community rituals*, manifested in the set pattern of daily and annual rituals of religious or social nature; and (3) the *metaphorical cursus*,

⁵ A logical extension of this research would involve a detailed and systematic analysis of Old Norse time words, which, however, would exceed the limits of this paper.

⁶ Cf. among others A. J. Gurevich, *Categories of Medieval Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1985), 93–152; Jacques Le Goff, *Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 29–42.

⁷ The following ideas are largely based on Anne Higgins, "Medieval Notions of the Structure of Time," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 19, no. 2 (1989): 227–250, at 227ff.

⁸ The hope of a recurring pattern in history is reflected in the self-consoling refrain of the Anglo-Saxon *Deor* poet: "þæs ofereode, þisses swa mæg" ('that passed away, so may this'). George Philip Krapp and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie, eds. *The Exeter Book*, Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 3 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), 178–179. Translation is mine.

which accounts for recurring patterns in history. Unlike the first two, the third is not based on regularity. Like the Wheel of Fortune, it promises change and allows for the anticipation of a future different from the present, but the change is temporally unpredictable. The cyclical view of time is based on the experience of past generations (or rather the present generation's interpretation thereof), and is essentially past-oriented, since it is the past that is reflected (and repeated in an altered form) in the present, and thereafter in the future.

The finite nature of individual human life (from birth to death) also promotes another, *linear* concept of time, one which emphasizes a distinct beginning and end. The projection of this linear concept of time onto the history of mankind goes back to the Hebrew sense of history, and is commonly understood to be the predominant Christian (or, to be more precise, Augustinian) concept of history and time.⁹ Christianity turned history into "salvation history," with God acting through his agents. It promoted the idea of a marked beginning or origin of time at Creation and an end of time on Judgment Day, and these two events served as the two endpoints of linear time as it is perceived by humans. Since history is the unfolding of God's plan of salvation, it is teleological, shaped by design, and proceeds towards an end. The well-defined end and purpose of history makes this a future-oriented understanding, with events that cannot be repeated.

The future-orientation of linear time and the past-orientation of cyclical time are united in the third notion, *figurative* time. This concept originated as a focus on similarity and resemblance, and was later promoted by the tradition of figural interpretation in the converted areas of medieval Europe. In the figurative perception of time, "past and future are fused in the present of the figure, filling it with meaning, while the meaning of the figure itself is diffused throughout all time."¹⁰ Thus, a unity of time is created and temporality is dissolved, that is,

⁹ It was St. Augustine (in *De civitate Dei*, Book 12) who most vigorously articulated objections to the classical notion of recurrence and the Platonic ideas of eternal return, contrasting them to the "straight path" of Christian time. Higgins, "Medieval Notions," 230–231.

¹⁰ Higgins, "Medieval Notions," 248. In *De Trinitate* (Book 15, chapter 7), St. Augustine explains the same notion from God's perspective: "[...] what are called past things are not past for Him, [...] but both past and future things are all present together with present things." Saint Augustine, *The Trinity*, trans. by Stephen McKenna, *The Fathers of the Church* 45 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963), 467. See also *Confessiones*, Book 11, chapters 14–21.

the figurative relation between events separated by time becomes more important than their chronological relationship.

Essentially, all three structural concepts approach time as an entity with physical dimensions and offer models that we can visualize with our inner eyes. In exploring and expressing time, we are actually reflecting on the relationship of events and actions *within* time, rather than the abstract concept of time itself. Time is merely a sequence of events, or manifestations of action, and it is these events that are arranged in space. It is from the perspective of action that the three above-mentioned notions of time (cyclical, linear, and figurative) make most sense, and it is their relations to action that actually distinguish the three concepts of time. In cyclical time, it is actions and events that are repeated, not objective time periods. A period or segment of time is only over if the associated action is completed. The linear time of Christianity is defined by the act of salvation and the plan concerning this. It is one temporal unit with a distinct beginning and end—a created time that exists in a created place for a specific purpose. Finally, figurative time is defined by the very patterns of action that are being repeated. Without action, there is no figurative time, and therefore there is no time at all.

The following lexical analysis of three Old English time words will explore how the notion of time and its relation to space and action are reflected in language. If language reflects culture (which it undoubtedly does), time words in Old English should reflect the Anglo-Saxons' understanding of time and its structure.

Words for lengths of time in Old English

Old English has a large number of words that denote the concept of time, and the various members of this wide lexical spectrum reflect different aspects of temporal perception. To give a detailed overview of all these terms would go beyond the scope of this article, so I will focus on one semantic subfield which proves to be particularly reflective of the Anglo-Saxon notion of time: time periods, or lengths of time. The latter phrase itself is telling: it utilizes the conceptual metaphor TIME IS SPACE and suggests that time is something physical which has an extension that can be measured. In Old English this spatial understanding of the length of time seems to be connected with a very concrete spatial structure: the house or hall. The following is an

overview of the scholarly consensus on the structure of the semantic field of “time” in Old English, followed by a detailed analysis of three Old English time words, *fyrst*, *hwil*, and *fæc*, which are used as illustrative examples.

If we survey the group of words in Old English that refer to the length of a period of time, we notice two interesting things: on the one hand, there is a great variety of terms, and an even greater variety of compounds; and on the other, there is a surprising closeness between the meanings of the individual terms, suggesting that some of them may have functioned as synonyms. The minor differences in the meanings of these words are sometimes hard to grasp, and modern lexicographers face a number of challenges when evaluating the Old English corpus.

Time words in Old English were sensitive not only to genre-specific usage (e.g., prose versus poetry), but also to dialectal distribution. The uncertain transmission history of vernacular texts means it is not always possible to distinguish specific dialectal layers and trace potential substitutions of time words in the different versions of a text (which would help to determine if there was a local preference for one term or another). In addition, we also have to consider personal preferences in the choice of vocabulary, a factor which seems to be significant for the understanding of the distribution of time words in Old English, as Janet Bately has argued on the basis of the occurrence of time words in early West Saxon prose texts.¹¹

Last but not least, we must also take cultural transitions into account. Although in terms of their etymology, Old English time words can be

¹¹ Janet Bately, “On Some Words for Time in Old English Literature,” in *Problems of Old English Lexicography: Studies in Memory of Angus Cameron*, ed. Alfred Bammesberger, Eichstätter Beiträge 15 (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1985), 47–64, at 57. Bately’s survey has shown that Anglo-Saxon writers’ choices of particular time words were to a great extent the result of personal preference. Her most conclusive evidence is provided by alterations to and replacements of numerous time words in different manuscript versions of late ninth-century texts, such as the later revision of Wærferth’s translation of St. Gregory’s *Dialogues* preserved in the Hatton manuscript. However, since the revision is dated to the tenth or eleventh century, it may also reflect changes in meaning over time. See David Yerkes, *Syntax and Style in Old English: A Comparison of Two Versions of Wærferth’s Translation of Gregory’s Dialogues*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies 5 (Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, SUNY Binghamton, 1982), and David Yerkes, “The Translation of Gregory’s *Dialogues* and Its Revision: Textual History, Provenance, Authorship,” in *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986), 335–343.

assumed to reflect a pre-Christian notion of time, we need to consider the fact that all our written sources from Anglo-Saxon England come from the post-conversion period. This fact necessarily suggests the possibility of Christian influence on the notion and structure of time and its reflection in the Old English lexicon. As Kurt Jankowsky has pointed out, Christianity was a “translated” culture for the Anglo-Saxons, a text-based religion for which a new set of vocabulary had to be created.¹² The early translators and glossators of Christian texts had to adapt the vernacular language and vocabulary of the pre-Christian community and create a new set of terminology for a different world view.¹³ Accordingly, they had to match native time words with Latin terms and attempt to convey non-native concepts and temporal perceptions. For example, the Old English names of the canonical hours, or fixed offices, reflect the methods of these translators, who would either coin native words (e.g., Old English *under(n)tid* for “terce,” lit. “morning-time”) or simply adopt the Latin original (Old English *prim* for “prime”).¹⁴ Some equivalences needed more serious theological consideration, such as the correct choice of an Old English time word to denote Christ’s stay in his tomb. The choice of Old English *fæc* (e.g., in Wulfstan’s *Homily no. 7*) conveyed the idea of a limited, temporally well-defined, and thus transitory stay, as opposed to eternal entombment (see the discussion of the word *fæc* below). The pairing of words in the translation of Latin into Old English could never be perfect, of course. As Jankowsky noted, with the pessimism of a careful and critical lexicographer:

¹² Kurt R. Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts and Their Germanic and Indo-European Cognates,” in *Festschrift für Karl Schneider*, ed. Ernst S. Dick and Kurt R. Jankowsky (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1982), 95–110, at 96.

¹³ See, for example, the vernacular names of certain religious holidays, e.g., Easter (Old English *easter*, *eastre*), which reflects the incorporation of local pre-Christian traditions, here the veneration of the goddess *Eostre* (Northumbrian *Eastre*). C. T. Onions, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), 298, s.v. “Easter;” and *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), <<http://oed.com>>, s.v. “Easter.”

¹⁴ Observations on the Old English lexicon and the specific meanings of words in Old English are based on J. Bosworth and T. Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (London: Oxford University Press, 1898); J. R. Clark Hall and Herbert D. Meritt, *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, 4th ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996 (1960)); and, where applicable, on *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* online, ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey, et al. with web interface by Peter Mielke and Xin Xiang (Toronto: DOE project, 2007), <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>>.

The [Old English-Latin] meaning equivalences that occur in the earlier texts, in spite of the enormous achievement which they constitute, are not only imprecise, but also outright misleading. The need for “semantic innovations” to cover adequately new subject matter, of necessity obscured and curtailed the full range of the previously established meanings of the word units involved.¹⁵

Of course, the use of native words in a new cultural context not only “obscured and curtailed” earlier ranges of meaning, but also enriched and restructured the semantic fields of certain words. From the perspective of a modern lexicographer or translator, the most challenging feature of the semantic field of time is the seemingly imprecise meaning of many of the words and the large amount of overlap between them. One reason for the coining of compounds is the need to further specify or extend the meaning of otherwise imprecise terms. As with adjectival and noun phrases (which essentially serve the same purpose), compounds can provide information about the semantic boundaries of a word.

There are at least twelve words in Old English that refer to the concept of time: *fæc*, *fyrst*, *hwil*, *mæl*, *sæl*, *sið*, *stefn*, *stund*, *hwearft*, *tid*, *tima*, and *þrag*. In spite of some degree of interchangeability and overlap in usage, these terms are not perfectly synonymous. They all have specific meanings and feature in numerous compounds, a fact which prompts and allows us to further stratify the semantic category of time. Nothing demonstrates more clearly the perplexing nature of this semantic field, and of modern scholarly attempts to dissect it, than the rather complicated category of “a time, period of time” (5.11) in *A Thesaurus of Old English*, which lists eleven sub-categories and many more subdivisions within them.¹⁶ This careful division essentially goes back to two basic sub-categories: (1) words denoting the length of a time period versus (2) those referring to a particular point in time. Some words (e.g., *tid*, *tima*) have such a wide spectrum of meaning that they belong to multiple subgroups. The following words and phrases can be listed as belonging to these two categories:¹⁷

¹⁵ Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts,” 96–97.

¹⁶ Jane Roberts and Christian Kay, with Lynne Grundy, *A Thesaurus of Old English in Two Volumes*, Costerus New Series 131–132, 2nd rev. impression, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000), <<http://leo.englang.arts.gla.ac.uk/oethesaurus>>, §5.11, “a time, period of time.”

¹⁷ After Bately, “On Some Words for Time,” 50.

1. Length of a time period:
 - (a) Stretch, space, period of time: *dægtid*, *fæc*, *fyrst*, *fyrst(ge)mearc*, *hwil*, *hwilfæc*, *hwilþrag*, *rum*, *ryneþrag*, *tid*, *tima*, *þrag*, *þinggemearc*.
 - (b) A long space of time: *langfyrst*, *leng(u)*, *tid*.
 - (c) A short period of time: *hwilsticce*, *lytel*, *sticce*, *prica*.
 - (d) An instant, moment: *bearhtm*, *bearhtmhwil*, *beorhthwil*, *brachwil*, *eagan beorht*, *eagan byrhtm*, *handhwil*, *preowthwil*, *princ*.
2. Point of time (time of occurrence, occasion, opportunity, particular time): *byre*, *cierr*, *dæg*, *dogor*, *mæl*, *niht*, *sæl*, *sið*, *stund*, *tid*, *tima*, *þrag*.

Group 1(d) is a borderline case. It could almost be considered part of subcategory 2, but since these words suggest an interest in the extreme shortness of a time period rather than the event associated with it, it seems more fitting to place them in the first subcategory.

In what follows, I will focus on three words from group 1(a) that denote a particular stretch of time (of unspecified length): *fyrst*, *hwil*, and *fæc*. The etymologies (and to some extent the contemporary use) of *fyrst*, *hwil*, and *fæc* not only indicate a spatial conceptualization of the length of time, but also (in the case of *fyrst* and *fæc*) support the idea of a link between the concept of time and the house or hall, a specific space of cultural and social significance.

Fyrst (first, ferst, fierst, frist)

The noun *fyrst* (masculine or feminine) has two seemingly different but historically related meanings in Old English, a temporal and a spatial, which are distinguished by grammatical gender. In a temporal sense *fyrst* (masculine) means (1) "space of time, (limited or specific) period of time;" (2) "(elapsed, indefinite) period of time;" (3) "delay, postponement, time allotted/allowed for a particular purpose, respite."¹⁸ *Fyrst* (feminine) has the spatial meaning: (1) "inner roof, ceiling, especially an ornamented ceiling;" (2) "roof" (glossing Latin *tignum* and *tigillum*, "beam, rafter", when used as a metonym for "roof"); (3) "support for a roof or ceiling, ridgepole, beam, pole;" (4) "entrance"

¹⁸ For all definitions and occurrences, see Cameron, *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. "fyrst," as well as related lemmata in Bosworth and Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* and in Hall and Meritt, *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*.

(glossing Latin *liminium*, perhaps referring to the lintel of a door). While the masculine form (with the temporal meaning) occurs around 350 times in the surviving sources, the feminine form (with the spatial meaning) is only attested sixteen times. Old English *fyrst* (*fyrest*) also appears as an adjective in the meanings “first in time or serial order; first in position, furthest forward, foremost, front; foremost in rank, importance, merit or virtue, leading, chief, principal.” In a related sense, it is also used adverbially for “first (in time), for the first time, originally; first (in place, in a list).”

The origin of the word lies in the Proto-Germanic superlative formation **furisto-* (from **fur-*, **for-*).¹⁹ Jankowsky postulates that the oldest meaning of the word was “first, uppermost in space,” with a subsequent twofold division into (a) the sphere of community life (cf. German *Fürst* “prince”) and (b) the field of time measurement.²⁰ It is interesting to note that in Old High German (as well as in Old Saxon), two different forms developed, one with and one without metathesis, which distinguished the temporal and spatial meanings: Old High German *frist* means “time, period of time, appointed time, moment,” while *first*, “mountain ridge, peak, summit, roof,” retained the spatial aspect.²¹ In Old English, the forms with metathesis do exist, but only as spelling variants, with no difference in meaning. Instead, the two semantic aspects are distinguished by grammatical gender (masculine versus feminine), which is probably a later development.

Old English *fyrst* also features in compounds which further specify its meanings in both its temporal and its spatial senses. The occurrence of compounding may also be an indication of a need to further delimit an otherwise ambiguous word. The compound *fyrstmearc*, “interval, space of time, period of time, appointed time,” emphasizes the limitations of a time period and its well-defined beginning and end by using a concrete spatial reference: the word *mearc*, “mark,” suggests two fixed points in time that mark out an interval. *Firsthrof*, “ceiling, ridgepole,” specifies the spatial meaning of *first* by associating it with the uppermost segment of a building, i.e., the section of space above

¹⁹ Onions, *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, s.v. “first,” *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “first.”

²⁰ Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts,” 100.

²¹ Rudolf Schützeichel, *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed. (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1981) and Gerhard Köbler, *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 4th ed. (1993), s.vv. “frist” and “first” at <<http://www.koeblergerhard.de/germanistischeswoerterbuecher/althochdeutscheswoerterbuch/ahdF.pdf>>.

which is marked out by the roof (*hrof*). Both compounds seem to suggest a linear expanse, horizontal or vertical. The Old High German meaning “mountain ridge, peak, summit” is based on the same idea (applied to topography).

The limited number of occurrences of the feminine noun and the need for compounding in order to emphasize the spatial extension suggest that Old English *fyrst* in itself has limited reference to spatial extension. According to Jankowsky, the word *fyrst* “converts time space into ‘time events’ of unit character with minimal emphasis on spatial extension.”²² In other words, it stands for a period of time that is characterized and defined by a corresponding event.²³ The third meaning of the masculine noun (“delay, postponement, time allotted/allowed for a particular purpose, respite”) and the related verb form *fyrstan*, “to grant time, respite,” imply not only a limitation of time, but also an association with a specific event or action which will either be completed or will set in at the end of the allocated time period. Based on the usage of *fyrst* in *Beowulf* (where it appears seven times),²⁴ Raymond Tripp suggested that the word also carried “connotations of eschatological urgency.” The time associated with the word *fyrst* is a “limited, precious commodity for men, and an odor of mortality clings to it.”²⁵ In the poem, this word often refers to a limited time period preceding a fateful event, or to time spent on preparation or in fear.²⁶

As we have seen above, etymologically speaking, Old English *frist* is a superlative formation. It is based on two Indo-European roots: **pr-*, **per-*, **por-* (Proto-Germanic **fer-*, **fir-*, **for-*) and **st(h)i-*, **st(h)a-* (Proto-Germanic **sti-*, **sto-/sta*).²⁷ Evidence from words with the prefix **per-* in other Indo-European languages indicates the interrelation

²² Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts,” 101.

²³ The nature and expanse of these time events are further specified by syntactic context. They can have a fixed time span (*to anes geares fyrste*; *nihtlange fyrst*) or undetermined duration (*lytlan fyrst*; *lengra fyrst*; *æfter miclum fyrste*), and can be a fixed point in time (*by fyrste*; *on ðam fyrste*) or designate a time period, with special emphasis on its starting or end point (*he fyrst næfde*; *fyrstes geunnan*). Cf. Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts,” 101.

²⁴ In lines 76, 134, 210, 528, 545, 2555, and 2573. Cf. Fr. Klaeber, ed. *Beowulf and The Fight at Finnsburg*, 3rd ed. (Boston: D.C. Heath, 1950), 337.

²⁵ Raymond P. Tripp, Jr., “The Homiletic Sense of Time in *Beowulf*,” *In Geardagum* 21 (2000): 23–40, at 30.

²⁶ See esp. lines 134, 210, 528, 2555, 2573.

²⁷ Based on Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts,” 103–104. Cf. also Gerhard Köbler, *Indogermanisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed. (2000), <<http://www.koeblergerhard.de/germanistischeswoerterbuecher/indogermanischeswoerterbuch/idgP.pdf>>.

of spatial and temporal aspects, with spatial meanings including “far, beyond, further, higher, forward,” and, interestingly, temporal ones embracing a past aspect (“last year, old, of last year”). Words in which the two above-mentioned roots co-occur in various Indo-European languages show both spatial and temporal meanings. Spatial meanings include “in front, before” (Old Indic); “ridge, hill-top” (Old Indic, Avestan); and “door post, pillar, column, arcade” (Greek, Latin); while the temporal meanings include “time” (Tocharian) and “old” (Old Irish). In Old English (and in West Germanic languages in general) there is a strong association of the word *fyrst* with house building and the structure of houses and halls, which seems to provide the link between the temporal and spatial meanings of the word. Jankowsky postulates the following theory to explain the origin of the temporal-spatial association:

We assume that in all probability the horizontal ridge beam of the roof was a means to measure the movements of the sun, and hence served as a device to establish a time unit that implied linear time extension with precise delimitation via emphasis on beginning and end. The mountain ridge must have fulfilled an equivalent function: to provide fixed places in nature marking sunrise, height of the sun at a particular time of day, and sunset.²⁸

Jankowsky bases his argument on ideas concerning the cultic and ritual functions of buildings and house construction, about which we have little information. We have equally limited knowledge of the exact methods of house construction in the early medieval period. Nonetheless, the crucial significance of weight-bearing poles and ridge beams cannot be disputed, and their key architectural functions of measurement and support certainly lent them cultic and ritual functions as well.²⁹ The use of beams and poles as instruments of time measurement thus seems plausible.

²⁸ Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts,” 105.

²⁹ See, for example, the ritual of casting overboard a carved beam from Thor’s temple in the homeland to determine the new place of settlement in Iceland in *Eyrbyggja saga*. Cf. also the unique positioning of a huge post outside at the northern corner of the supposed temple (building D2) at Yeavering in Northumbria, matched by another three posts inside at the southern end. Cf. Hilda Ellis Davidson, *The Lost Beliefs of Northern Europe* (London: Routledge, 1993), 22.

Hwil (*hwyl*, *hwile*)

The word *hwil* is versatile in Old English. As a feminine noun, it means “a while, space of time, a period of time, a long or short time (usually specified by the phrase).”³⁰ In addition to its nominal, adverbial, and adjectival uses, it can also function as a conjunction: *þa hwile* (*þe*), “as long as.” *Hwil* occurs many times in the surviving sources, mainly in an adverbial function (as accusative and dative singular and plural, e.g., *hwilum*, “sometimes; once, at one time”).³¹ It also features in numerous compounds, both as the first, modifying element and as the second, modified one. Interestingly, in most cases in which *hwil* occurs as the first element (e.g., in *hwiltid*, “moment,” *hwilfæc*, “while, a space of time,” *hwilþrag*, “a period of time,” and *hwilsticce*, “interval, short space of time”), the second element of the compound is also a time word. In compounds with *hwil* as the second, modified element (e.g., *gryrehwil*, “time of terror, terrible time,” *wræchwil*, “time of exile,” *rothwil*, “time of refreshing,” and *gesceaphwil*, “fated hour”), the first part is a concept not related to time. This first element specifies the type of action which characterizes the given time period, often reflecting a personal, even emotional aspect.

In contrast to Old English *fyrst*, the word *hwil* seems to have no obvious spatial meaning. In a 1916 article, Olaf Johnsen does cite three occurrences in charters of the phrases *sume hwile* and *ane lytle hwile* meaning “a short distance” or “a little further” in the context of referring to directions.³² Based on these adverbial uses, Johnsen postulates that “*hwil* originally had a local sense of ‘a space of ground’ or the like,” and that the temporal sense of “a space of time” was developed from the local meaning.³³ Since the context is a definition of space, the above examples may indeed suggest an underlying, possibly older, spatial meaning used metonymically in a temporal sense here, referring

³⁰ Cf. Bosworth and Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, and Hall and Meritt, *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, s.v. “*hwil*.”

³¹ A search of the online Old English Corpus of the Dictionary of Old English project (<<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/o/oec>>) gave over fourteen hundred occurrences, of which ca. five hundred are for “*hwilum*.”

³² “*þanon west on ða ealdan dic. þonne sume while and land þære dice;*” “*þonne norþ rihte sume hwile;*” “*7 lang hricgges to þam wege þe scyt fram fealuwes lea to baddan by ane lytle hwile.*” In Olaf Johnsen, “More Notes on Old English Adverbs and Conjunctions,” *Anglia* 39 (1916): 101–120, at 118. The examples are included in the Old English Corpus of the Dictionary of Old English project.

³³ Johnsen, “More Notes,” 118.

to the amount of time needed to cover the distance.³⁴ Thus, these examples suggest an intermingling of space and time—a phenomenon that we have seen above.

The Old Norse cognates provide further evidence for the assumption that *hwil* once had both temporal and spatial meanings. While in Old English the spatial meaning became obsolete, in Old Norse it is the time aspect that is missing. All Old Norse words related to Old English *hwil* refer to quietude, rest, and repose (cf. the nouns *hvíla*, “bed, resting place,” *hvíld*, “rest, repose; pause,” *hvílbæðr*, “bed of rest,” and the verb *hvíla*, “to rest, take a rest; to lie, rest, sleep in a bed; to lie buried”).³⁵ In these examples, the emphasis seems to be on the place of action. The time component is not totally absent, however: rather the flow of time is put on hold by the temporary suspension of action. The related Gothic verb form *hveilan*, “to stay, sojourn, rest, cease,” reflects the same idea.³⁶ The emphasis is on the use of time for a particular action, in particular on the length of time or “stopping of time” used to take a break from action.

As a time word, therefore, *hwil* implies extension rather than a point in time, with a focus on duration, but no emphasis on the beginning and end of the time period referred to, although these are clearly determined. It implies a time period defined by action (generally short rather than long). The use of the word as a conjunction in Old English (“while, whilst, meanwhile”) also points to a meaning which emphasizes duration and extension. The example of the (mainly poetic) adjective *unhwilen*, “eternal,” is particularly telling in this context. The negation of *hwil* (using *un-*) suggests that *hwil* refers to a defined segment of time as opposed to the unlimited time of eternity. In “eternal,” the shortness of time is negated, not time itself.³⁷

³⁴ Cf. Knowles and Moon, *Introducing Metaphor*, 53.

³⁵ Geir T. Zoëga, *A Concise Dictionary of Old Icelandic* (Mineola, NY: Dover, 2004 (1910)), <<http://www.northvegr.org/zoega>>, s.vv.; cf. Richard Cleasby and Gudbrand Vigfusson, *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. by William A. Craigie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957).

³⁶ The Modern English verb “to while” is a new formation, first attested in the early seventeenth century. It has no continuity with early Middle English *i-hwulen*, “to have leisure,” and shows no connection with the Continental forms (Old High German *wîlôn*, “to stay, linger,” Old Norse *hvíla*, “to rest,” Gothic *hveilan*, “to pause, cease,” etc.). Cf. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “while (verb).”

³⁷ Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts,” 106.

Fæc

The Old English noun *fæc* (neuter, occasionally masculine) shows some overlap in meaning with both *fyrst* and *hwil*.³⁸ It expresses both spatial and temporal expansion of undetermined length or duration. In the temporal sense, it denotes a “(fixed) period of time, interval, while.” In the case of *fæc*, the actual period of time is expressed using phrases and compounds, which indicates the need to determine or specify the nature and length of a time period (e.g., *lytell/unmicel fæc*, “a short period,” *lang(sum)/micel fæc*, “a long period,” *twegra daga fæc*, “two days’ time,” and *liffæc* or *lifes fæc*, “the period of one’s life”). The three days that Christ spent in the grave are also referred to as a *fæc* by Wulfstan (Homily 7).³⁹ In Homily no. 27 (Napier 30; “Be rihtan cristendome”), the phrase *þis fæc*, “this span of time,” refers to “(the transitory) life on earth.”⁴⁰ As Tripp remarked: “Compared to eternity, the whole of time itself is but a *fæc* followed by Judgment Day.”⁴¹ This idea is reflected in the definition of Latin *seculum* in Byrhtferth’s Manual: “Seculum man hæte ealne þæne <fæc> [MS fæt] fram frymðe þisre worulde oð hyre ende” (lit. ‘one calls *seculum* the entire period of time from the beginning of this world to its end.’)⁴² Two specific Latin terms are glossed with genitival constructions by way of explanation: *fæc ƿ fifygear/fif wintra fæc*, “a period of five years,” glosses Latin *lustrum* (a period of five years, based on the ritual purification of the Roman people after the census every five years) and *fif geara fæc/fif wintra fæc* glosses Latin *olympias*, “olympiad,” (in the specific poetic sense “five year period”).⁴³ Among Latin equivalents for *fæc* we find in the glosses *intercapedo*, *intervallum*, *spatium*, *tempus*, and specific time periods such as *triduum*, *quadrinoctium*, etc.

In a spatial sense, *fæc* means “space, area; (intervening) space, gap” (usually between two well-defined points or places, e.g., between letters of a lunar table in Byrhtferth’s Manual).⁴⁴ As with the temporal meaning, genitival constructions are needed to refer to the specific

³⁸ For definitions and occurrences, see Cameron, *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. “fæc.”

³⁹ The same concept (the period of Christ’s stay in the tomb) is expressed with *hwil* in a homily by Ælfric; cf. Bosworth and Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, s.v. “hwil.”

⁴⁰ Cameron, *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. “fæc,” 1.d.

⁴¹ Tripp, “The Homiletic Sense of Time,” 31–32.

⁴² Cameron, *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. “fæc.”

⁴³ Cf. Cameron, *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. “fæc,” 1.b.i–ii.

⁴⁴ Cameron, *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. “fæc,” 2.a.

length of the distance (e.g., *halfre mile fæce*, “(a distance of) half a mile”). Two occurrences in Aldhelm suggest a third meaning of the word, that of “difference, dissimilitude (of state or condition).” This symbolic sense seems to have derived from the spatial meaning, and glosses Latin *intervallum*. One of the two occurrences has *hwil l fæc* for *intervallum spatium*, which suggests an overlap in the meaning of the two Old English words.⁴⁵

In Old High German, only the spatial meaning is found: Old High German *fah* is attested in the meanings “part, wall, weir; ?department, ?wood.”⁴⁶ The word goes back to Proto-Germanic **faka-*, **fakaz*, “part, department, enclosed area,” and ultimately to the Indo-European root **pak-*, **pag-*, which is associated with enclosing and binding.⁴⁷ Jankowsky postulates that in its earliest meaning, the word denoted the distance between two posts in the wall of a house, i.e., the space which had to be filled with wattle. Later, the meaning of the word moved towards the functional aspect, and came to mean the wattle itself, and still later it came to mean “fence” and “wall,” irrespective of the material.⁴⁸ There is no convincing evidence for this development, but the association of the word with the process of house building or the enclosing of certain areas with the help of a wall, probably of wood or wattle, is certain. This architectural meaning is still apparent in German *Fachwerk*, “half-timbered construction,” but later on the meaning of the word was expanded to refer to enclosed or compartmentalized spaces in an abstract sense as well (German *Fach*, “compartment, drawer, pigeon-hole, subdivision, bay, subject, business, area of expertise”).⁴⁹ The senses of Dutch *vak* (“department, section, square, subdivision, trade, craft”) imply a similar extension of meaning. Similarly, in the cases of Old Saxon *fac* and Old Frisian *fec*, *fak*, only the spatial meaning can be found (in Old Frisian this is also related to house building), while the temporal reference is missing. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the Continental sense of the word is

⁴⁵ Cameron, *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. “fæc,” 3.

⁴⁶ Köbler, *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, s.v. “fah;” see also Gerhard Köbler, *Neuenglisch-althochdeutsches Wörterbuch* (2006), <<http://www.koeblergerhard.de/germanistischewoerterbuecher/althochdeutscheswoerterbuch/neuenglisch-ahd.pdf>>.

⁴⁷ Köbler, *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, s.v. “fac;” Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern: Francke, 1948–69), 787.

⁴⁸ Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts,” 98.

⁴⁹ Lexical references to modern languages are based on standard Modern English dictionaries of the respective languages.

thus chiefly “compartment” or “bounded space.”⁵⁰ Jankowsky considers the restriction of the word to the spatial meaning only to be a later development, and suggests that the double meaning is probably the Germanic original, not an Old English innovation.⁵¹

The Indo-European cognates of *fæc* generally refer to the concepts of fastening, binding and enclosure: nominal forms denote either the means of fastening or the thing being fastened, while verbal forms refer to fastening and binding in general. The origin of the Germanic forms may lie in the wickerwork method of house construction, in which twigs are plaited between two posts. According to Jankowsky, the posts thus establish “a constant measure of space which in all likelihood constituted the basis for a measurement of time.”⁵² The house thus becomes a unit of time and space—a microcosmic world with spatial and temporal existence.

This leads us back to Bede’s reference to the hall as a metaphor for human life, that is, for a particular temporal unit with a God-given beginning and end. As the etymologies and lexical analyses of the three Old English time words have shown, Bede’s metaphor is rooted in an earlier, pre-Christian understanding of time and space, and offers a new, Christian reinterpretation thereof—cleverly applied in a conversion situation to bridge the two traditions. In order to further validate the Germanic (or possibly even earlier) origins of this time-space connection, I argue that there are parallels to this conception of time, space, and action in the best documented mythological system of Germanic origin: the mythology of early medieval Scandinavia.

*The pre-Christian perception of time and space:
the Norse mythological evidence*

The reconstruction of a pre-Christian Anglo-Saxon (or Germanic) worldview is problematic, not least because of the scarcity of non-linguistic (i.e., narrative, visual, or material) sources. Therefore, the relative abundance of Old Norse/Icelandic textual sources offers not only tempting but indeed valuable comparative material for the study of the pre-Christian origins of the understanding of time and space

⁵⁰ *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “fec.”

⁵¹ Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts,” 99.

⁵² Jankowsky, “On Old English Time Concepts,” 99–100.

in the Anglo-Saxon world. The potential fallacies are obvious, and, naturally, given the temporal and geographical differences between the Anglo-Saxons and the Scandinavian communities as well as the various degrees of influence of Christianity on the Norse textual sources, parallels should always be treated with care.

In general, Old Norse mythological literature shows limited concern for time and chronology. The study of the concept of time in Norse mythology is usually connected to the analysis of the structure of space in the mythic world. The sources provide little descriptive detail about the mythological space. The mythic world has been described in scholarly literature as comprising the binary opposition of two spatial axes, horizontal and vertical, which correspond to two different aspects of time.⁵³ The two poles of the vertical axis are the heavens and the underworld, connected by Yggdrasill, the cosmic tree, with the “well of fate” (*Urðarbrunnr*) at its root. Following Margaret Clunies Ross’s argumentation, in temporal terms this axis symbolizes the irreversibility (and linearity) of time, where a fate is laid out for each individual. The horizontal axis comprises the habitats of the gods, giants, and men, and “concerns what one might call a ‘steady state’ relationship between the gods and the giants, in which negative reciprocity is taken as an unchanging given.”⁵⁴ This “reversible” time (Clunies Ross’s term), where change brings about no significant development, guarantees that the cosmological order remains constant. This idea of a clear-cut opposition between the vertical and the horizontal models and the concepts of irreversible and reversible time has been criticized by Jens Peter Schjødt, who pointed out that, on the one hand, Yggdrasill, the cosmic tree, was also associated with the notions of renewal, repetition, and return, and on the other, the conflicts between gods and giants

⁵³ Cf. Eleazar Meletinskij, “Scandinavian Mythology as a System I–II,” *The Journal of Symbolic Anthropology* 1–2 (1973–74): 1:43–58 and 2:57–78; Paul C. Bauschatz, *The Well and The Tree: World and Time in Early Germanic Culture* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1982), 119–154; Kirsten Hastrup, *Culture and History in Medieval Iceland: An Anthropological Analysis of Structure and Change* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 50ff; Kirsten Hastrup, “Cosmology and Society in Medieval Iceland: A Social Anthropological Perspective on World-View,” in *Island of Anthropology. Studies in Past and Present Iceland*, The Viking Collection 5 (Odense: Odense University Press, 1990), 25–43; Margaret Clunies Ross, *Prolonged Echoes. Old Norse Myths in Medieval Northern Society*, Vol. 1: *The Myths*, The Viking Collection 7 (Odense: Odense University Press, 1994), 229f.

⁵⁴ Clunies Ross, *Prolonged Echoes*, 229.

were in fact decisive in determining the cosmic order.⁵⁵ In spite of the problematic nature of anchoring these temporal concepts in mythological space, the coexistence of the notions of linear and non-linear time can be discerned in Norse mythology and the Norse worldview.

As with the Christian Middle Ages, therefore, the perception of time in the pagan North was a combination of linear and cyclical structures. The linear aspect of mythic time can be detected in the succession of distinctive periods. The time span of Norse mythology can be divided into four major eras, but the chronology of the individual eras is often unclear. The four eras are (1) the mythical prehistory of the creation (Ymir's age); (2) the mythical present (which includes aspects of eternity and constitutes the temporal framework of the majority of the myths); (3) the eschatological end of time (Ragnarøk); and finally, (4) the distant future of the new world which will be created after the destruction of this world. It is the mythological "present," the long period of Óðinn's reign, initiated by Ymir's murder, which is the most vague in chronological terms. Most events are said to have happened *í árdaga*, "in days of yore." The sequence of related myths is relatively easy to determine, but the chronological relationship between these groups of myths is hard to establish. Even Snorri's *Prose Edda*, which shows strong euhemeristic tendencies, seems "timeless:" it only offers an occasional systematizing of myths, and the arrangement is topical (action-related) rather than chronological (time-related).

It is only the eschatological events of Ragnarøk that show a relatively simple and stable chronology from (1) pre-Ragnarøk (a number of events that directly lead up to the final battle between gods and giants and the end of the world) through (2) the invasion of Ásgarðr, the world of the gods, the final battle, and the destruction of the world to (3) the rebirth of the universe and the establishment of a new social order. The duration of the individual phases and the sequence of particular events within each phase are less clear, however. There is a sense of temporal linearity reflected in this vague chronology, a course of events running from Ymir's age to Ragnarøk, but in contrast to

⁵⁵ Jens Peter Schjødt, "Horizontale und vertikale Achsen in der vorchristlichen skandinavischen Kosmologie," in *Old Norse and Finnish Religions and Cultic Place-Names. Based on Papers Read at the Symposium on Encounters between Religions in Old Nordic Times and on Cultic Place-Names held at Åbo, Finland, on the 19th–21st of August, 1987*, ed. Tore Ahlbäck (Åbo and Stockholm: The Donner Institute for Research in Religious and Cultural History/Almqvist and Wiksell, 1990), 35–57, at 54ff.

Christian history, creation is not necessarily a terminal event in a temporal sense. In fact, there are three creations involving the gods: (1) the creation of the world from the body of Ymir; (2) the creation of men and dwarfs after the disruption of the golden age of gods; and (3) the creation of the new world after Ragnarøk. The three creations suggest a sense of repetition, the idea of renewal and return, and the first and third creation acts clearly involve the creation of a physical space associated with a new temporal unit, or age. The assumption that there will be a new world after Ragnarøk does not support the idea of an apocalyptic-linear expectation of the end of time, and suggests instead a recursive or cyclical concept of time.⁵⁶

The etymology of Old Norse *veröld*/Old English *weorold* “world” illustrates the coupling of an anthropocentric view of the world with a temporal sense: it is a compound derived from the words “man” and “age,” with the world thus being the “age of men/humankind.”⁵⁷ Not only was this world human-centered, it was also essentially temporally defined. In addition to the association with the material world, Old English *weorold* also denoted “the present state (with reference to time), age, lifetime,” and even “men, people” and “the course of human affairs.”⁵⁸ This temporally defined, human-centered concept of the world is suggestive of a dynamic relationship between and interdependence of time, space, and action. Norse mythology offers a unique kind of evidence for the position of man within these coordinates in the shape of the mythical symbolism of Loki’s three children.

Time, space, and action as coordinates of human existence

The interdependence of time, space, and action and the centrality of these to human life are reflected in the understanding of these three coordinates as the three essential limitations of human existence. The three monster-children of Loki and the giantess Angrboða—the Miðgarðsormr (Midgard Serpent), Fenrir the wolf, and Hel—embody through their eschatological roles the eternal threat to the world and

⁵⁶ See, among others, Rudolf Simek, *Dictionary of Northern Mythology* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1993), 334.

⁵⁷ Cleasby and Vigfusson, *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, s.v. “veröld;” *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “world.”

⁵⁸ Bosworth and Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, s.v. “weorold.”

the existence of the gods, and, at the same time, each monster personifies one of the essential limitations: the Miðgarðsormr the spatial boundaries, Hel the limits of life and death, and Fenrir the limitation of time.⁵⁹

The Miðgarðsormr lies in the outer sea, biting its own tail and encircling the world of men and giants as an enclosure.⁶⁰ Due to its ferocious nature, it sets a boundary which no one can pass, and thus demarcates the spatial limits of the world. It is constantly being challenged by its mythical adversary Þórr, whom it encounters in two key episodes (in Þórr's fishing expedition with the giant Hymir and during his visit to the hall of the giant Útgarða-Loki) long before their third, fatal encounter at Ragnarøk. These stories indicate an ongoing struggle of mythic dimensions between the two.

Hel is the name of both the female ruler of the world of the dead and the underworld itself, the home of those who die of illness and old age. She guards the passage between life and death, and welcomes those who die a natural and involuntary death.⁶¹ The names of her halls, objects, and servants, documented in chapter thirty-four of Snorri's *Gylfaginning*, suggest aspects of physical hardship that impact the human body; they include names such as Hunger, Famine, Damp, Lazy Walker, Stumbling Block, Sickbed, and Shining-Harm. On a basic level, Hel represents the limitations of the flesh. However, sickness and aging ultimately limit one's ability to *act*, and thus the real focus is

⁵⁹ On the idea of the monsters as incarnations of metaphysical principles, see Carolyne Larrington, "Loki's Children." Conference paper delivered at the 13th International Saga Conference, Durham and York, August 2006. Published (in an altered form) in *The Fantastic in Old Norse/Icelandic Literature/Sagas and the British Isles: Preprint Papers of the 13th International Saga Conference, Durham and York, 6th–12th August 2006*, ed. J. McKinnell, D. Ashurst, and D. Kick (Durham: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2006), <<http://www.dur.ac.uk/medieval.www/saga-conf/sagapps.htm>>, 1:541–550.

⁶⁰ The exact position of the outer sea in relation to the world of men, Miðgarðr, and the world of giants, Útgarðr, is unclear. It may surround both habitats, or serve as a dividing line between the two.

⁶¹ Christopher Abram has recently pointed out that "in the Poetic Edda and related texts, Hel is primarily a place within the mythic cosmos; the earliest skaldic verse, on the other hand, gives prominence to a female mythological figure who serves as a personification, not of the realm, but of death itself." Christopher Abram, "Hel in Early Norse Poetry," *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia* 2 (2006): 1–29, at 22. Both Hel's original, more limited mythical role as a personification of death and her later, extended role as the ruler of the underworld are in line with the present argumentation and support the idea of her symbolic representation of the limitations of the action coordinate.

on the limitation of action, the third axis of the time–place–action coordinates.

The third monster, Fenrir the wolf, represents the temporal limitation of existence. This is the least explicit symbolic connection of the three, and thus requires some explanation. References to Fenrir in the textual sources are contradictory, and the conception of the mythical canine may have undergone some changes over time. The clearest evidence comes from Snorri (*Gylfaginning*, chapters twenty-five and (esp.) thirty-four), who relates Fenrir's history among the gods and his fettering by Týr, names Fenrir as the devourer of Óðinn, and tells of his death at the hands of Víðarr, Óðinn's son and avenger. The account in *Völuspá* is far less clear. The Eddic poem makes references to three, seemingly different, ferocious canines: (1) the unnamed wolf that swallows Óðinn; (2) Garmr, the chain-bound hound of the underworld (probably also a wolf); and (3) another unnamed wolf that devours the two celestial bodies, the sun and the moon, at Ragnarøk. Characteristically, Snorri makes a careful attempt to disentangle the threads. He identifies Garmr as Týr's adversary at Ragnarøk (which does not seem particularly logical considering Týr's loss of a hand due to Fenrir), and names Sköll as the devourer of the sun and Hati Hróðvitnisson as the swallower of the moon. The origins of all three canines, carefully distinguished in later sources, may lie in one and the same beast, a more ancient mythical canine. The later wolves or hounds represent different aspects of the original beast's mythic role: that of being fettered by the gods in order to prevent him fulfilling his prophesied eschatological role, and of later fulfilling this role by killing Óðinn and swallowing the celestial bodies. The association of this figure with time and temporal limitation is manifested, on the one hand, in the swallowing of the sun and the moon, which breaks the natural cycle of days, and, on the other, by the killing of Óðinn, which brings to an end the era of the "mythical present," the age of the gods.

The Norse gods are not only aware of these limitations and the threats they pose, but continuously try to contest them: Þórr pursues the Miðgarðsormr, and the gods eat Iðunn's apples to defy aging and fetter Fenrir to hold off the coming of the end. I believe that all three of the limitations of existence associated with Loki's offspring are alluded to in a symbolic way in the contest at Útgarða-Loki's hall, an idea which offers a new interpretation of this episode and elevates its mythical significance. In chapters forty-six and forty-seven of *Gylfaginning*, Snorri gives an account of a series of tricks Útgarða-Loki plays on

Þórr and his traveling companions, Loki and Þjalfi, in the form of a contest of strength and skill. Loki engages in an eating contest with Logi (“fire”) and Þjalfi races against Hugi (“mind, thought”), but both suffer a narrow defeat. Þórr himself is challenged by three adversaries of symbolic significance. First, he has to drain a drinking horn in three gulps; second, he has to lift up the host’s grey cat from the ground; and third, he is called on to wrestle with Útgarða-Loki’s old nurse, Elli. He also fails all three challenges. This is not surprising, considering the impossibility of the tasks, which is revealed to him and his companions the next morning by Útgarða-Loki himself: the other end of the horn was out in the ocean, the cat was the Miðgarðsormr itself, and in the old woman was Old Age. In the course of his three challenges, Þórr fought against the three limitations of existence in symbolic form. The references to the Miðgarðsormr and to aging are obvious, but the temporal aspect, represented by the drinking contest, is less explicit. According to Útgarða-Loki, Þórr’s three drafts from the horn caused ebbs in the ocean, and his feat is eternally commemorated by the tides.⁶² The ocean and the concept of time have numerous parallels: they are both characterized by endlessness and are of unpredictable nature which is nonetheless unchanging in the grand scheme of things, and the rhythm of the tides provides a physical manifestation of the cyclical nature of time. The same idea is presented in Fenrir’s swallowing of the sun and the moon, by which he puts an end to created time and the temporal cycle based on the motion of the celestial bodies. Although the medieval Scandinavians did not know that the tide is actually caused by the gravitational force of these celestial bodies, their linking of these two natural phenomena, the movement of the celestial bodies and the tide, to the concept of time reflects the careful observations of a seafaring people.

At Ragnarøk, Yggdrasill trembles and groans, but whether it is destroyed or not remains unclear, leaving the questions of the extent of the eschatological destruction open. It is the end of time in the sense of *created* time, a well-defined *segment* of time which was fashioned by the gods. Thus, the world, “the age of humankind,” ends, ending with it the largest and most central unit of time, which is signified by a

⁶² “The other end of the horn, which you could not see, was out in the ocean. When you come to the ocean you will see how much your drinking lowered it. This is now known as the tides.” Snorri Sturluson, *The Prose Edda. Gylfaginning*, trans. Jesse L. Byock (London: Penguin, 2005), 62, chapter 47.

large pole or pillar, Yggdrasill itself. The pole or pillar which was holding the universal construct of the world was also the central structural element of houses and halls. In spite of all the uncertainties regarding its exact structure, the edifice of the inhabited universe as a whole was thus not dissimilar to a man-built hall: it was organized around a supporting pillar (Yggdrasill), furnished with a roof (the sky from Ymir's skull, for further literary references see below), and associated with an enclosure⁶³ (the outer limits of which were demarcated by the Miðgarðsormr).

Conclusion

As we have seen above, the evidence provided by a variety of early Germanic sources, from Old English semantics to Old Norse/Icelandic mythography, indicates the interrelated nature of space, time, and action. The lexical evidence suggests the association of these concepts with a concrete space that embodied the unity of the three dimensions and was instrumental in structuring and measuring time: the house or hall as a building. Bearing in mind this temporal association, the hall can thus be interpreted as a man-made container of space associated with well-defined segments of time designated for particular social activities.⁶⁴ The archetypal hall of Norse mythology, Óðinn's Valhøll, the other-world of heroes, is itself a symbol of this unity of time, space, and action: a space for cyclically repetitive heroic action contained within the time unit of a day repeated over and over again.

The fact that a similar concept was known in Anglo-Saxon England is confirmed not only by lexical evidence, but also by the use of the hall metaphor with a temporal undertone in Old English literature. In the Old English elegies, halls (and buildings) are understood as containers of the past filled with desirable social activities (e.g., *The Wanderer*, lines 19–36, esp. 25; 73–80; 93; 110; *The Ruin*, lines 21–24; 31–37), and are thus the objects of desire of those who are exiled from that world, both in the physical and the temporal sense. In Bede's account, the hall stands not only for one's life on earth, but also for a symbolic

⁶³ The centrality of the idea of the enclosure is also suggested by the etymology of Old English *fæc* (see above).

⁶⁴ On the symbolic significance of walls, halls, and doors in the context of actions, space, and time, see Bauschatz, *The Well and The Tree*, 137ff.

space-time continuum and thus the whole world known to men. The transference of the concept of the world as a hall into early insular Christianity is reflected in Old English accounts of the Creation that describe the creation of the world in terms of constructing a hall or building. *Cædmon's Hymn* talks about heaven as a roof for men (line 6a: *heofon to hrofe*),⁶⁵ and, similarly, *Genesis A* mentions the building of the firmament of the sky (*heofontimber*, “heavenly structure,” in line 145) as a roof (lines 145, 153).⁶⁶ The rest of the passage in *Genesis A* (lines 144–153) alludes indirectly to construction through its diction.⁶⁷ The hall-world thus becomes a container of (created) time and human activities.⁶⁸

Since halls represented action-filled segments of time, it is not surprising that the measurement of time was associated with parts of a house or hall. This suggests an understanding of time as “spatial time,” conceived as an abstract space for action. In this sense, time is but a particular dimension of action, one which extends action into a different perspective. As we have seen above, time did not exist as an independent quantity in early medieval English and Scandinavian culture. There was no purely “temporal time;” rather time was a necessary component of the time–space–action coordinates: it was tied to physical space and was always filled with content, that is, action. The alignment of these coordinates created (and still creates) the experienced world.

⁶⁵ Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie, ed. *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 6 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), 106.

⁶⁶ George Philip Krapp, ed. *The Junius Manuscript*, Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 1 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931), 7.

⁶⁷ Noted in Alaric Hall, “The Meanings of Elf, and Elves, in Medieval England” (PhD dissertation, University of Glasgow, 2005), <<http://www.alarichall.org.uk/phd.php>> and <<https://dspace.gla.ac.uk/handle/1905/607>>, 68.

⁶⁸ An interesting extension of this understanding of the world on a microcosmic level may be reflected in two Old English words for ‘body,’ *banhus* (lit. bone-house) and *bansele* (lit. bone-hall). These constitute examples of the “body as house” metaphor (a modification of the common BODY AS CONTAINER conceptual metaphor) which was widely used in Old English but became lost in modern usage (cf. Kay, “Metaphors We Lived By,” 281–282).

Works Cited

- Abram, Christopher. 2006. Hel in Early Norse Poetry. *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia* 2: 1–29.
- St. Augustine [of Hippo]. 1963. *The Trinity*. Trans. Stephen McKenna. The Fathers of the Church 45. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Bately, Janet. 1985. On Some Words for Time in Old English Literature. In *Problems of Old English Lexicography: Studies in Memory of Angus Cameron*, ed. Alfred Bammesberger, Eichstätter Beiträge 15, 47–64. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet.
- Bauschatz, Paul C. 1982. *The Well and The Tree: World and Time in Early Germanic Culture*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Bede. 1991. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Ed. Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors. Corrected reprint. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bosworth, J. and T. Northcote Toller. 1898. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, Angus, Ashley Crandell AmCameron, Angus, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey et al., eds. 2007. *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* online. Toronto: DOE project. <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>>.
- Cleasby, Richard and Gudbrand Vigfusson. 1957. *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. by William A. Craigie. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clunies Ross, Margaret. 1994. *Prolonged Echoes. Old Norse Myths in Medieval Northern Society, Vol. 1: The Myths*, The Viking Collection 7. Odense: Odense University Press.
- Davidson, Hilda Ellis. 1993. *The Lost Beliefs of Northern Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Dobbie, Elliott Van Kirk, ed. 1942. *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 6. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gurevich, A. J. 1985. *Categories of Medieval Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Hall, Alaric. 2005. *The Meanings of Elf, and Elves, in Medieval England*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Glasgow. <<http://www.alarichall.org.uk/phd.php>>, <<https://dspace.gla.ac.uk/handle/1905/607>>.
- . 2007. *Elves in Anglo-Saxon England. Matters of Belief, Health, Gender and Identity*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 8. Woodbridge: Boydell.
- Hall, J. R. Clark and Herbert D. Meritt. 1996 (1960). *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. 4th ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hastrup, Kirsten. 1985. *Culture and History in Medieval Iceland: An Anthropological Analysis of Structure and Change*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1990. Cosmology and Society in Medieval Iceland: A Social Anthropological Perspective on World-View. In *Island of Anthropology. Studies in Past and Present Iceland*, The Viking Collection 5, 25–43. Odense: Odense University Press.
- Hedeager, Lotte. 2001. *Asgard Reconstructed? Gudme—a 'Central Place in the North'*. In *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Mayke de Jong and Frans Theuvs with Carine van Rhijn, 467–507. The Transformation of the Roman World 6. Leiden: Brill.
- Higgins, Anne. 1989. Medieval Notions of the Structure of Time. *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 19, no. 2: 227–250.
- Hume, Kathryn. 1974. The Concept of the Hall in Old English Poetry. *Anglo-Saxon England* 3: 63–74.
- Jankowsky, Kurt R. 1982. On Old English Time Concepts and Their Germanic and Indo-European Cognates. In *Festschrift für Karl Schneider*, ed. Ernst S. Dick and Kurt R. Jankowsky, 95–110. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Johnsen, Olaf. 1916. More Notes on Old English Adverbs and Conjunctions. *Anglia* 39: 101–120.
- Kay, Christian J. 2000. Metaphors We Lived By: Pathways Between Old and Modern

- English. In *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy*, ed. Jane Roberts and Janet Nelson, 273–285. London: King's College London and Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies.
- Klaeber, Fr., ed. 1950. *Beowulf and The Fight at Finnsburg*. 3rd ed. Boston: D.C. Heath.
- Knowles, Murray and Rosamund Moon. 2006. *Introducing Metaphor*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Köbler, Gerhard. 1993. *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. 4th ed. <<http://www.koeblergerhard.de/germanistischeswoerterbuecher/althochdeutscheswoerterbuch/ahdF.pdf>>.
- . 2000. *Indogermanisches Wörterbuch*. 3rd ed. <<http://www.koeblergerhard.de/germanistischeswoerterbuecher/indogermanischeswoerterbuch/idgP.pdf>>.
- . 2006. *Neuenglisch-althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. <<http://www.koeblergerhard.de/germanistischeswoerterbuecher/althochdeutscheswoerterbuch/neuenglisch-ahd.pdf>>.
- Krapp, George Philip, ed. 1931. *The Junius Manuscript*. Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 1. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Krapp, George Philip and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie, eds. 1936. *The Exeter Book*. Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 3. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 2003 (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Larrington, Carolyne. 2006. Loki's Children. In *The Fantastic in Old Norse/Icelandic Literature/Sagas and the British Isles: Preprint papers of the 13th International Saga Conference, Durham and York, 6th–12th August 2006*, ed. J. McKinnell, D. Ashurst, and D. Kick, 1:541–550. Durham: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies. <<http://www.dur.ac.uk/medieval/www/sagaconf/sagapps.htm>>.
- Le Goff, Jacques. 1980. *Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, Alvin A. 1972. *The Guest-Hall of Eden: Four Essays on the Design of Old English Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Magennis, Hugh. 1996. *Images of Community in Old English Poetry*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meletinskij, Eleazar. 1973–74. Scandinavian Mythology as a System I–II. *The Journal of Symbolic Anthropology* 1–2: 1:43–58 and 2:57–78.
- Neville, Jennifer. 1999. *Representations of the Natural World in Old English Poetry*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Onions, C.T., ed. 1966. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. 1989. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <<http://oed.com>>.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1948–1969. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- Roberts, Jane and Christian Kay, with Lynne Grundy. 2000. *A Thesaurus of Old English in Two Volumes*. Costerus New Series 131–132. 2nd rev. impression. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Rodopi. <<http://leo.englang.arts.gla.ac.uk/oethesaurus>>.
- Schjødt, Jens Peter. 1990. Horizontale und vertikale Achsen in der vorchristlichen skandinavischen Kosmologie. In *Old Norse and Finnish Religions and Cultic Place-Names. Based on Papers Read at the Symposium on Encounters between Religions in Old Nordic Times and on Cultic Place-Names held at Åbo, Finland, on the 19th–21st of August, 1987*, ed. Tore Ahlbäck, 35–57. Åbo and Stockholm: The Donner Institute for Research in Religious and Cultural History/Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Schützeichel, Rudolf. 1981. *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. 3rd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Simek, Rudolf. 1993. *Dictionary of Northern Mythology*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Snorri Sturluson. 2005. *The Prose Edda. Gylfagynning*. Trans. Jesse L. Byock. London: Penguin.

- Taylor, Paul Beekman. 1998. *Sharing Story: Medieval Norse-English Literary Relationships*. AMS Studies in the Middle Ages 25. New York: AMS Press: 107–122.
- Tripp, Raymond P. Jr. 2000. The Homiletic Sense of Time in *Beowulf*. In *Geardagum* 21: 23–40.
- Yerkes, David. 1982. *Syntax and Style in Old English: A Comparison of Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies 5. Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, SUNY Binghamton.
- . 1986. The Translation of Gregory's Dialogues and Its Revision: Textual History, Provenance, Authorship. In *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, 335–343. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Zoëga, Geir T. 2004 (1910). *A Concise Dictionary of Old Icelandic*. Mineola, NY: Dover. <<http://www.northvegr.org/zoega>>.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BASIC COLOUR TERMS OF ENGLISH

Carole P. Biggam
University of Glasgow

1. *Introduction*

The purpose of this article is twofold. Firstly, it aims to suggest an order of acquisition for those basic colour terms which currently feature in Present-Day English (PDE). There are many published articles on the basic colour terms of various languages, but they usually present the evidence synchronically, that is, they take the contemporary situation, and extrapolate theories of acquisition from that position. When the basic colour vocabulary of a major world language is considered, however, several of its basic colour terms are seen to have been acquired in languages ancestral to the one currently existing. Even a brief glance at the English terms makes it clear that the earliest examples must have been acquired in prehistory. In other words, a more enlightening view of basic term acquisition in a modern language can be obtained from a *diachronic* study, working forwards from prehistory to the present. This proposal raises the matter which is the second aim of this article: to suggest how such evidence can be retrieved from the distant past, and how an order of acquisition can be proposed. It is hoped that the use of prototype theory, along with comparative evidence from certain types of modern languages, will provide guidelines for establishing reasonable suggestions, and that these can be mapped against the “milestones” created by certain linguistic and socio-economic developments which provide a rough relative chronology.

2. *Basic colour terms*

The first step must be to understand the nature of basic colour terms. A distinction can be made in most languages between basic and non-basic vocabulary, and this article is only concerned with the basic terms of English and its ancestor languages. Although, of course, the most frequently encountered colour words of languages had long been

recognized as part of their basic vocabularies, an attempt to draw up guidelines for the recognition of basic colour words was made by Brent Berlin and Paul Kay in 1969.¹ Before considering the guidelines, however, it is helpful, especially in the light of this present article, to consider the likely background of early basic colour terms.

The initial step towards colour vocabulary is visual perception—simply seeing things. A prehistoric human, just like us, would have taken a lot of what s/he saw for granted, but certain things were considered important, and were mentally registered. This is the phase of cognition. A prehistoric human would certainly have registered what was vital for survival, for example, various foods and dangerous animals, and such things would have been recognized by a combination of features such as shape, behaviour and colour. While this stage involves a certain degree of colour cognition, the colour would not, at first, have been considered as a phenomenon independent of the object displaying it. At some point, however, our prehistoric human would have applied a linguistic label to the colour, thus coining a true colour term, but this term would probably still have functioned only within a certain context, such as animal colours, and would not have been basic, since basic terms evolve from more restricted non-basic terms.

In time, such a colour word may have proved to be so useful and frequently employed that it became abstract. In other words, cognition of the colour itself had evolved, as something independent of objects displaying it. Although the recognition of colours as independent phenomena is widespread in the modern world which takes for granted things like paint-selection charts and multiple colour choice in clothing, abstract concepts of colour are not so obvious to people living in a predominantly natural environment. Finally, the gradual development, in most languages, of a few of those abstract colour words into superordinate or generic terms for types of colour impression would have signalled the arrival of basic cognitive colour categories, each labelled with at least one basic colour term.²

¹ Brent Berlin and Paul Kay, *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press), 5–7. For a summary of the notion of basicness in colour vocabulary before 1969, see Barbara Saunders, “On the Concept of ‘Basic’ in Berlin and Kay’s Basic Color Terms,” *Antropologische Verkenningen* 12, no. 1 (1993): 37–39.

² This is not to suggest that words come before concepts but, simply, that in *historical* semantic studies, the use of vocabulary is the principal evidence for the likely existence of basic colour categories (concepts) in the minds of speakers of that language.

That brings us to the obvious question: how do we recognize a basic colour term? To answer this question, we have to start with attempts to achieve such recognition in *modern* languages, where verbal testing is possible. Berlin and Kay suggested four primary criteria for recognizing a basic colour term, and a further four secondary criteria should the first set prove inconclusive.

Berlin and Kay's primary criteria are as follows:³

1. A basic colour term should be monolexemic, in other words, its meaning should not be separately conveyed by its parts. The authors give the following examples as being excluded by this rule: *bluish*, *lemon-coloured*, *salmon-coloured*, and *the colour of the rust on my aunt's old Chevrolet*.⁴
2. A basic colour term should not be a hyponym of another colour term, in other words, its meaning should not be included within the meaning of a superordinate term (hyperonym). Berlin and Kay give the following examples as being excluded by this rule: *crimson* and *scarlet* (being hyponyms of *red*).
3. A basic colour term should not be narrowly contextually restricted, in other words, its application must not be restricted to a narrow class of objects. Berlin and Kay give the following example as being excluded by this rule: *blonde* (principally used of hair-colour).⁵
4. A basic colour term must be psychologically salient. Berlin and Kay suggest that this can be ascertained by testing for phenomena such as the following:
 - 4.1 the candidate word should have a tendency to occur at the beginning of lists of colour words made by native speakers;
 - 4.2 the word should have stability of reference across informants and occasions of use;
 - 4.3 the word should occur in the idiolects of all informants.

³ Berlin and Kay, *Basic Color Terms*, 6.

⁴ This criterion was later shown to be inappropriate for certain languages, for example, that of the Murray Islanders (New Guinea). This language duplicates the names of exemplars in order to create colour terms, for example, *mam*, "blood," is duplicated to create *mammam*, "red." (David Michaels, "Linguistic Relativity and Colour Terminology," *Language and Speech* 20, no. 4 (1977): 338.) Although Criterion 1 cannot be considered of universal application, it is acceptable in studies of English colour terms.

⁵ Although *blonde* has been used in the world of advertising, for example, of port (the drink) and furniture (usually made of pine), it remains to be seen whether these usages will become widespread.

These first four criteria for recognition of a basic colour term, as suggested by Berlin and Kay, will suffice to give the reader an idea of how such a tricky task can be attempted, and what sort of tests and questions are used by anthropological linguists. Although several writers since 1969 have pointed out that certain of Berlin and Kay's eight criteria are not applicable to languages they know, or are in some other regard lacking, there have been few attempts to completely revise them. The main problem is, of course, that the details of colour vocabulary across the world have been found to vary considerably, and a set of universal criteria seems elusive.⁶

The criteria for basic colour term recognition have mostly been developed by anthropologists and linguists studying modern, living languages. They ask native speakers to name colours, map the meanings of their words onto a colour chart, and to discuss the contextual restrictions of words, their symbolic usage, their function in religion and ritual, and so on. It should be immediately obvious that the major problem for *historical* linguists is that they have a complete lack of native speakers. In an attempt to cope with this problem, I have adapted some of the criteria for basicness to make them applicable to dead languages, but these adapted criteria require, as their raw data, surviving written (or printed) texts, and not even this reduced amount of data is available to support theories about colour in prehistory.

3. *Palaeolithic LIGHT and DARK*

Some of the basic colour concepts used by present-day English speakers have developed over such a long period of time that the longest established of them pre-date the English language itself. I do not underestimate the speculative nature of my suggestions for these early phases, and other researchers will certainly have other opinions on the matter but, for completeness, I have been bold enough to make some suggestions about basic colour concepts in prehistory. It must be stressed that my main concern at this early period is with *concepts*,

⁶ Contributions to the search for better criteria include those by Crawford, and by Corbett and Davies. See T. D. Crawford, "Defining 'Basic Color Term'," *Anthropological Linguistics* 24, no. 3 (1982): 338–343; and Greville G. Corbett and Ian R. L. Davies, "Establishing Basic Color Terms: Measures and Techniques," in *Color Categories in Thought and Language*, ed. C. L. Hardin and Luisa Maffi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 197–223.

or cognitive categories, not the terms that labelled them, although the attempts of others to reconstruct prehistoric word-roots will be mentioned. There are two ways in which it may be possible to understand the basic colour categories of prehistory: one concerns what is known about the order of acquisition of such categories as evidenced by *modern* languages, and the second possibility concerns prototype theory.

First of all, what can be learnt from modern languages? Anyone who has read a little about basic colour terms must be familiar with Berlin and Kay's other major proposal, that such terms were developed over time in the same order by all languages.⁷ That is to say that every language, for example, had a basic colour term focussed in the red area before it had a basic colour term focussed in the blue area. Over the years since 1969, there has been a huge amount of both criticism of and support for this theory, and the details of the evolutionary sequence have been emended several times.⁸ Nonetheless, it has proved impossible to comprehensively refute that modern languages with few basic colour terms always distinguish between white and black, and, later, develop a basic term for red. Similarly, it can be observed that modern languages with just a few more basic colour terms usually have terms for either yellow or green or both.⁹ Provided we accept that

⁷ Berlin and Kay, *Basic Color Terms*, 2–5.

⁸ Probably the most important revisions of the sequence are to be found in the following publications: Paul Kay, "Synchronic Variability and Diachronic Change in Basic Color Terms," *Language in Society* 4 (1975): 257–270; Paul Kay and Chad K. McDaniel, "The Linguistic Significance of the Meanings of Basic Color Terms," *Language* 54 (1978): 610–646; Paul Kay, Brent Berlin and William Merrifield, "Biocultural Implications of Systems of Color Naming," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 1 (1991): 12–25; Paul Kay, Brent Berlin, Luisa Maffi and William Merrifield, "Color Naming across Languages," in *Color Categories in Thought and Language*, ed. Hardin and Maffi, 21–56; Paul Kay and Luisa Maffi, "Color Appearance and the Emergence and Evolution of Basic Color Lexicons," *American Anthropologist* 101, no. 4 (1999): 743–760.

⁹ It is possible to make these observations because languages do not all acquire basic colour terms at the same rate. Thus, there are modern languages with just two or three basic terms, and others with eleven or more. This difference in the rate of acquisition enables researchers to observe the process. (I have deliberately kept the colour terminology simple at this stage. It will be employed more accurately as the paper develops.) It has been suggested that the recognition of black and white and the unique hues of red, green, yellow and blue are "hard-wired," or innate in human neurophysiology, and that this underlies the widespread similarities observed in the order of acquisition of basic colour concepts around the world. Although this is widely believed, the exact nature of the neurology is not yet understood. A useful summary of the suggestions and problems can be found in David Bimler, "Are Color

prehistoric societies acquired basic colour categories and terms in the same order, we can, at least, begin to reconstruct the process.

If we next consider prototype theory, it is possible to add another strand to the emerging picture. It was mentioned above that certain phenomena of economic and cultural importance are mentally registered, and these can become the foci or prototypes of cognitive categories, for example, the concept of APPLE could become the focus of a category comprising EDIBLE FRUITS.¹⁰ It has been plausibly suggested by Anna Wierzbicka that colour categories evolve, not from colours *per se*, but from objects which typically display such colours.¹¹ Modern English has a familiar example of this with the word *orange*, which is now a basic colour term, as well as a fruit term, but which once indicated only the fruit. The fruit itself must have been the early prototype of the evolving colour category. It is reasonable to assume that prehistoric humans evolved their colour categories in the same way, and I have suggested elsewhere that the order of acquisition of such categories may be linked to major features of economic and technological progress.¹²

With the help of these two approaches, it can be seen that the white and black colour categories can be expected to have evolved before any others. But what exactly do these concepts consist of? The first two categories of the 1969 sequence were labelled “white” and “black” by Berlin and Kay because their stated intention was to label only the foci (or colour prototypes) of each category, believing them at that time to be universal.¹³ All later versions of the sequence referred to whole categories rather than just foci, and, from 1975 onwards, the sequence endeavoured to express the latest research findings which showed that

Categories Innate or Internalized? Hypotheses and Implications,” *Journal of Cognition and Culture* 5, no. 3/4 (2005): 293–347.

¹⁰ Categories and their prototypes are culturally and geographically constrained, so that, in a society in which oranges, for example, were more frequently eaten and/or more prized than apples, or in which apples were simply unknown, a different prototype for this category could be expected.

¹¹ Anna Wierzbicka, *Semantics: Primes and Universals* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 329–334.

¹² C. P. Biggam, “Prototypes and Foci in the Encoding of Colour,” in *Categorization in the History of English*, ed. Christian J. Kay and Jeremy J. Smith, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series IV: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 261 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004), 19–40, at 28–32. Berlin and Kay, among others, made this observation in general terms, but did not link particular advances with particular basic categories. (Berlin and Kay, *Basic Color Terms*, 104.)

¹³ Berlin and Kay, *Basic Color Terms*, 13.

early colour categories were, in simple terms, very large. This means that they included areas of the colour space which, in a society with a larger number of basic colour categories, would be considered quite distinct. These large categories are called *macro-categories* or *composite categories*. The category represented by focal "white" in 1969 is now shown on the sequence as W/R/Y (white/red/yellow) and can be called *macro-white*. The category once represented by "black" is now shown as Bk/G/Bu (black/green/blue) and can be called *macro-black*. These macro-categories each represent a single colour concept for the societies that use them, and are usually each denoted by a single basic colour term.¹⁴

When the likely original motivation for developing these categories is considered, it is important to mention Wierzbicka's suggestion that the key to understanding them lies in the primitive twin concepts of SEEING and NOT SEEING, which in turn suggest the prototypes of DAY and NIGHT.¹⁵ This is entirely compatible with my belief that very early colour concepts were mentally registered because of their importance for human survival. The unavoidable daily contrast between day and night still governs our lives, but how much more important it would have been to an early society. In the daytime they could search for food, and see approaching danger, while night-time was, no doubt, terrifying because the life-giving sun deserted them, and they were more vulnerable to attack.

The crucial and, perhaps, original concepts of SEEING versus NOT SEEING were obviously related to the possibly later concepts of DAY and NIGHT which involve the additional semantic element of a period of time. Only a slight semantic extension from DAY and NIGHT produces the first true colour concepts of LIGHT and DARK, and it is possible to imagine how this happened, particularly in the case of DARK, with dark items like the back of a cave or a dense wood being referred to as "resembling night." This first recognition of colour, in its very broadest sense, involved early people mentally registering a brightness difference, and brightness is an element of colour. While the cognition of SEEING and NOT SEEING must be at least as old as the human

¹⁴ The colour codes used in the current sequence are as follows: Bk (black), Bu (blue), G (green), R (red), W (white), and Y (yellow). Combinations of codes can indicate macro-categories, for example, W/R/Y indicates MACRO-WHITE.

¹⁵ Wierzbicka, *Semantics*, 301–303.

species, is it possible to give an approximate date to the development of the basic cognitive categories of LIGHT and DARK?

It should be understood that the small and largely isolated prehistoric human communities of this period would not have developed their technological and linguistic skills at the same rates, but certain generalizations can be made. A particular prehistoric society may have had concepts and words for LIGHT and DARK but this does not mean they were necessarily basic. One of the criteria for basicness is that the colour term must not be restricted to a narrow class of objects, but must be applicable to any object of the appropriate colour.¹⁶ In other words, such colour terms denote colours as independent concepts, for example, DARKNESS, not tied to other features such as horses or human hair.

It appears to be the case that contextual freedom would only have been possible when the development of the human mind achieved a certain degree of flexibility. Although any theories on the working of the prehistoric human mind are bound to be controversial, Steven Mithen's suggestion of a development from modules to cognitive fluidity has gained considerable support.¹⁷ In brief, it is suggested that the primitive mind gradually developed modules which each controlled certain aspects of the lives of early humans: social intelligence (for interacting with other humans); natural history intelligence (for understanding the environment); technical intelligence (for making and using tools); and, possibly separate, linguistic intelligence. The essential point to make about these modules is that they operated separately, and did not interact. In time, however, connections were forged between the modules until a lesson learnt in one module could be applied in another. This interaction is the meaning of cognitive

¹⁶ See above, section two, Criterion 3. John Lyons argues that "context-restrict-edness" should not debar a colour word from basic status. (John Lyons, "Colour in Language," in *Colour: Art and Science*, ed. Trevor Lamb and Janine Bourriau (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 194–224, at 207.) Lyons, however, understands *basic* in extremely broad terms. He refers to "Level-1" words like English *black*, *white* and *red*, and "Level-2" words like English *scarlet*, *mauve* and *turquoise* (Lyons, "Colour in Language," 202). Since he refers to Level-2 words as "less basic" than Level-1 words, he must be using a definition of *basic* quite unlike that of Berlin and Kay, who would regard his Level-2 words as non-basic.

¹⁷ Steven Mithen, *The Prehistory of the Mind: A Search for the Origins of Art, Religion and Science* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996). Mithen, of course, recognizes that his ideas owe much to other scholars, such as Jerry Fodor and Annette Karmiloff-Smith.

fluidity, a facility which enables metaphor and analogy, creativity and invention, and, most appropriately for the present discussion, abstract thought.¹⁸

Since a basic colour term must be applicable to any appropriately-coloured object, and since this involves an abstract colour concept, there could have been no such thing before cognitive fluidity. Mithen dates the gradual development of this facility in various parts of the world to between sixty and thirty thousand years ago, at a period of change between two cultural phases which is known to archaeologists as the Middle to Upper Palaeolithic transition.¹⁹ All that can be said about the date of the evolution of the basic colour concepts of LIGHT and DARK is that it could not have predated this period, since basic colour concepts require cognitive fluidity. *Non*-basic concepts, however, such as those indissolubly linked with certain animals, could have existed long before, located in a particular module of the brain.

Consideration of this earliest phase must be restricted to a discussion of concepts, not words, hence the use of LIGHT and DARK in small capitals, which is a linguistic convention to indicate concepts, as opposed to italics to indicate words. In Section 5 below, certain aspects of a later reconstructed language are presented, and this shows that, just like modern languages, it may have contained *many* words relating to ideas of darkness and lightness. Any of these words could have descended from the two earliest colour terms, or indeed, those earliest terms may have left no descendants at all.

4. *Palaeolithic or Mesolithic MACRO-RED*

Turning once again to the evidence of *modern* languages, we find that the next colour category acquired is some form of redness. Kay and Maffi note that both vision specialists and lay people intuitively regard red as the most salient of the hues, and the best evidence for its early

¹⁸ Ibid., 66–72.

¹⁹ Ibid., 152–154; Steven Mithen, “From Domain Specific to Generalized Intelligence: a Cognitive Interpretation of the Middle/Upper Palaeolithic Transition,” in *The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology*, ed. Colin Renfrew and Ezra B. W. Zubrow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 29–39. The term *palaeolithic* refers to the Old Stone Age, a cultural phase which, like other such phases, occurs at different times, and for different periods of time in the histories of different peoples. Later phases include the Mesolithic (Middle Stone Age) and Neolithic (New Stone Age).

appearance as a basic colour category comes from the twenty-one languages with only three basic colour terms presented by Berlin and Kay in 1969, and the accumulating evidence for this salient position of a red term in the acquisition of basic colour terms among children.²⁰ It is clear from the evidence of Berlin and Kay's languages, however, that the early red category can be very large, including many or all of the colours often referred to as "warm."²¹ This basic colour category is referred to as *macro-red*, and it emerges when the earlier MACRO-WHITE or LIGHT category (W/R/Y) divides into two new categories: W and the macro-red category R/Y. Why does this division take place? This question can be posed more accurately as: which prototype could motivate this division of the earlier category?

The question brings the discussion back to the work of Wierzbicka, who regards the prototypes of colour categories as parts of the natural environment which have typical colours, for example, blue sky, green grass, and white snow, although, of course, allowance must be made for geographical variation. While I agree that the early motivation for evolving a new colour category is not a colour, but an object-prototype of the appropriate colour, I disagree that environmental features are the most likely early prototypes. The reason for this is that the natural background colours of everyday life are exactly the things which everyone takes for granted. I suggest that the most likely prototypes are things which are vital for human survival or wellbeing, which have to be mentally registered, carefully watched, and discussed with others.

The prototype suggested by Wierzbicka for MACRO-RED, however, does not represent a background feature; it is fire. This is an excellent suggestion for at least two reasons. Firstly, the colours of fire, and associated objects, are spread widely across the macro-red colour range: flames are orange and yellow, glowing wood is red, and scorched material or cooked meat is brown. In addition to this, fire provides light at night, linking it to the brightness element of MACRO-WHITE from which the new category had emerged, and fire also provides heat which might have been associated with the heat of the bright day. This means that, although MACRO-RED is regarded as the first hue category,

²⁰ Kay and Maffi, "Color Appearance," 748–749.

²¹ The red term in Baganda includes pink, orange, brown, and purple; in Ndembu it includes yellow; in Tiv it includes "all warm colours through red to yellow, brown," and so on. (Berlin and Kay, *Basic Color Terms*, 52–63).

its prototype would demand that BRIGHTNESS should form an essential element in its composition.

The second reason as to why fire is a good prototype for MACRO-RED is that it represents a crucial survival-aid for early humans. The ability to create and manage fire was probably the first ground-breaking technological achievement, and it would have made a huge difference to human survival. Fire provided warmth in winter, made food easier to eat, offered protection from predators at night, provided a focus for social gatherings, and made it possible to settle the colder regions of the world. With such a central role in human life, the appearance, behaviour, and properties of fire must have been discussed and linguistically labelled in prehistoric social groups.

With the LIGHT and DARK concepts, the suggested prototypes of DAY and NIGHT had, of course, been always present, long before they gave rise to basic colour concepts. On the other hand, while fire is a natural phenomenon, the colour category prototype is suggested to have been *managed* fire, namely, a camp-fire started and controlled by humans. Does the date of this technological advance help with the estimate of when a basic category for MACRO-RED was achieved?

Clearly, the management of fire was achieved at different dates in different parts of the world, but it was such an early discovery that it predates the development of cognitive fluidity which, as has been seen in the previous section, must have been present before basicness could be achieved.²²

5. *Proto-Nostratic*

The discussion thus far has been limited to theoretically existing colour concepts but, at the dawning of a new cultural phase, something can be said about the language possibly used to label such concepts. At the end of the last Ice Age, about ten thousand years ago, archaeologists discern a new cultural phase called the Mesolithic, or Middle Stone Age, and certain linguists have endeavoured to reconstruct a language

²² One of the earliest sites to yield evidence for the control of fire is in Israel, where it has been dated to almost 790,000 years ago (Naama Goren-Inbar, Nira Alperson, Mordechai E. Kislev, Orit Simchoni, Yoel Melamed, Adi Ben-Nun and Ella Werker, "Evidence of Hominin Control of Fire at Gesher Benot Ya'aqov, Israel," *Science* 304, no. 5671 (2004): 725–727.

they call Proto-Nostratic (PN) which was spoken at that period, and perhaps earlier. Needless to say, Proto-Nostratic is highly controversial, but should not be omitted for that reason.

Proto-Nostratic is reconstructed from apparent cognates in several of the proto-languages of the world, themselves being reconstructed languages. Just as searches for cognates in languages like Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Latin and so on, produced a reconstructed language called Proto-Indo-European (PIE), similar work has also been done for other language families, producing several proto-languages, all of which are controversial to a greater or lesser extent. The presence of cognates between these proto-languages has then been suggested, indicating an even earlier common ancestor, and it is this language which is called Proto-Nostratic.

Allan Bomhard and John Kerns have published a list of over six hundred suggested Proto-Nostratic word-roots, along with details of the proto-languages from which they were reconstructed.²³ I have retrieved the colour terms from this list, along with others denoting concepts such as FIRE, and the results are suggestive, although I am unable to treat them as hard evidence. There are ten word-roots indicating concepts related to LIGHT and BRIGHT, and thirteen roots denoting concepts related to FIRE and BURNING. A further six roots indicate both BRIGHT and BURNING. There are also eleven roots denoting concepts related to BLACK and DARK.²⁴ No word-roots at all have been defined as "red," or as referring to any other hue. If Proto-Nostratic were a language which had left written records, I would find these results perfectly compatible with the evidence from modern languages, and with theories on the development of basic colour terms. There is an interest and concern with lightness/brightness and darkness which suggests that LIGHT and DARK were recognized concepts, whether basic or not. The interest in FIRE and BURNING suggests a likely prototype for a MACRO-RED concept which is yet to develop. Proto-Nostratic reconstructions, therefore, could be taken to indicate

²³ Allan R. Bomhard and John C. Kerns, *The Nostratic Macrofamily: A Study in Distant Linguistic Relationship* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994).

²⁴ As most of the word-roots are given multiple senses, the totals given here should be regarded as approximations only. The following numbers refer to entry numbers in Bomhard and Kerns's list of word-roots: LIGHT and BRIGHT: 15, 16, 20, 86, 228, 393, 403, 450, 457, 580; FIRE and BURNING: 43, 63, 92, 207, 240, 299, 314, 335, 376, 381, 438, 491, 495; BRIGHT and BURNING: 82, 87, 119, 142, 461, 494; BLACK and DARK: 13, 29, 77, 78, 101, 153, 274, 373, 388, 462, 539.

that the concept of MACRO-RED evolved during the Mesolithic, rather than the Palaeolithic, but different groups of people no doubt recognized this concept at widely differing dates.²⁵

6. *Proto-Indo-European YELLOW or YELLOW + GREEN and Basic Colour Terms*

The study of modern languages with four basic colour terms suggests that the next category to emerge after MACRO-RED is either YELLOW or one of the two macro-categories of GRUE or YELLOW + GRUE.²⁶ Even in Berlin and Kay's simple 1969 sequence of category foci, this stage caused such uncertainty that they had to incorporate two options, dividing their Stage III into IIIa and IIIb. This was the only sub-divided stage at that date, and, furthermore, their next stage, Stage IV, acted in a complementary fashion to Stage III. Their suggestion was that languages acquired a basic colour term for GREEN (IIIa) or YELLOW (IIIb) at Stage III, and then acquired whichever basic colour term of these two they lacked, at the next stage.²⁷ This represents an effort to cope with the extremely close cognitive relationship, at that stage, of these areas of the colour space. After much more research, the currently accepted options for the stage following MACRO-RED are as follows:²⁸

1. Emergence of the cognitive category of Y, thus leaving R/Y (macro-red) as R.
2. Emergence of the cognitive category of G/Bu (grue), thus leaving Bk/G/Bu (macro-black) as Bk.
3. Emergence of the cognitive category of Y/G/Bu (yellow + grue). This category apparently combines Y from R/Y with G/Bu from Bk/G/Bu, so its origin is currently considered uncertain.

²⁵ Kerns writes: "The more I study the matter, the more I am convinced that the spread of the Nostratic speaking peoples was occasioned by the spread of the Mesolithic culture..." (Bomhard and Kerns, *The Nostratic Macrofamily*, 154).

²⁶ *Grue* is a term constructed from the English words *green* and *blue*, referring to a macro-category consisting of that part of the colour space. In some cases, GREY is also included.

²⁷ Berlin and Kay, *Basic Color Terms*, 23.

²⁸ Taken from Kay and Maffi, "Color Appearance," 748-749. The options, or developmental routes, are now known as "trajectories."

Whichever developmental route, or trajectory, a society may take, the end result at this stage appears to be, principally, a concern with the yellow and green areas of the colour space. What was the motivation for mentally registering these areas as distinct from their parental categories, and why are they so closely related?²⁹ I suggest that the reason, for those societies which adopted agriculture, may be the growing of cereal crops.³⁰ The major socio-economic development of the adoption of agriculture arrived in south-east Europe from Anatolia about nine thousand years ago, ushering in a cultural phase known as the Neolithic, or New Stone Age. This involves an increasing interest in a settled life growing crops and raising animals, as opposed to a more nomadic existence. Could this have provided the prototype for the next colour categories?

Wierzbicka suggests the sun as the prototype for YELLOW,³¹ but there is a problem with this, as sunlight would have been closely connected with daylight, or, perhaps, with fire, two previously used prototypes (if the suggestions made above are correct), and the crucial thing about new prototypes is that they point out a *difference* from established categories, not a similarity. Even if the sun were accepted as an appropriate prototype for a new yellow category, however, it would be unsuitable for those cultures with new categories that involved elements of grue (G/Bu and Y/G/Bu).

I have suggested that the prototype for the next colour categories could be cereal crops because this involves a colour distinction of great importance for human survival in an agricultural community.³² The most important observation in cereal farming is whether the crop is ready for harvesting or not, and this crucial development is denoted by colour; the change from green to yellow. When a crop begins to ripen, it does not do so uniformly, so that a field at this stage is a constantly-changing interaction of these two colours. It is suggested

²⁹ This is especially surprising since data from the World Colour Survey shows that red and yellow are considered more like each other than like blue or green (Clyde L. Hardin, "Explaining Basic Color Categories," *Cross-Cultural Research* 39, no. 1 (2005): 83).

³⁰ This suggestion was first made in Biggam, "Prototypes and Foci," 30.

³¹ Wierzbicka, *Semantics*, 314–317.

³² Because this paper is following the basic colour terms of English, there is a concentration on Europe, and the primitive cereal varieties brought from the Middle East. It is recognized, of course, that other agricultural societies may have depended on different crops. Furthermore, any societies with basic terms for GREEN and YELLOW which never adopted agriculture must have had other prototypes.

that this is the reason why green and yellow are so closely associated in the observed development of basic colour categories. In the currently accepted trajectories, whichever route is followed, the next two categories after MACRO-RED complement each other in the interaction of yellow and grue or green. The trajectories are as follows:

4. Where the cognitive category of Y already exists, a category of G or G/Bu (grue) follows.
5. Where the cognitive category of G/Bu already exists, a category of Y follows.
6. Where the cognitive category of Y/G/Bu (yellow + grue) already exists, a category of G/Bu or Y/G follows.

So far, discussion has been based on concepts, not words. If cereal crops really do constitute the prototype for colour categories related to YELLOW and GREEN, then the concepts must have arisen soon after the commencement of settled agriculture, when the appearance of crops, concentrated in a field, was something of a novelty. The dating of the Neolithic, as it occurs in various regions, is fairly secure from the archaeological evidence, but there is considerable controversy over related linguistic matters concerning Proto-Indo-European, the ancestor of many modern European languages and some Asian ones as well. It has been suggested, principally by Colin Renfrew, that the Proto-Indo-European language was spread across Europe by the same people who brought agriculture to the area, and this would, of course, date the language as far back as the ninth millennium BP.³³ Others, following Marija Gimbutas,³⁴ have argued for a later date, connecting the spread of the language with the Kurgan culture, whose people expanded from their Russian homeland into parts of Europe, and elsewhere, in the fifth and sixth millennia BP.³⁵

³³ Colin Renfrew, *Archaeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins* (London: Cape, 1987).

³⁴ M. Gimbutas, "The Beginning of the Bronze Age in Europe and the Indo-Europeans 3500–2500 BC," *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1 (1973): 163–214; M. Gimbutas, "Old Europe c. 7000–3500 BC, the Earliest European Cultures Before the Infiltration of the Indo-European Peoples," *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1 (1973): 1–20.

³⁵ For a review of the evidence, see Peter Bellwood and Colin Renfrew, eds., *Examining the Farming/Language Dispersal Hypothesis* (Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 2002). Bernard Comrie suggests a distinction between primary and secondary farming dispersal, the former occurring where farming was not

Whatever its origin, the concept and a word-root can, apparently, be reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European and, unlike Proto-Nostratic, Proto-Indo-European has been reconstructed from languages which have actually left surviving records. Is it possible to say which trajectory was followed by Proto-Indo-European, as its speakers acquired concepts related to YELLOW and GREEN?

Julius Pokorny's dictionary of Proto-Indo-European roots gives some guidance on the emerging colour concepts.³⁶ The word-root which eventually produced the English word *yellow*, along with many other Indo-European cognates, is PIE **ǵhel-*, defined by Pokorny as "glänzen, schimmern" ('to shine, to glitter'), and, as a colour adjective, "gelb, grün, grau oder blau" ('yellow, green, grey or blue').³⁷ It is easy to accept **ǵhel-* as having a LIGHT/BRIGHT sense since that concept would appear to represent the origin of colour recognition, and can be seen to feature strongly in a list of the reconstructed Proto-Indo-European root-definitions.³⁸ It could reasonably be expected to remain as a residual semantic element of colour words at the same time as some developed additional hue elements.

Pokorny's list of colours in the definition of PIE **ǵhel-* includes the conjunction "or," not "and," so I assume he is allowing the possibility of any single colour or combination of those colours. If this choice is applied to the trajectories listed by Kay and Maffi for Stage III, it allows any of the routes numbered one to three above. When

previously practised, and the latter occurring as a change in farming techniques in an already agricultural region (Bernard Comrie, "Farming Dispersal in Europe and the Spread of the Indo-European Language Family," in *ibid.*, 409–420). He associates the spread of Proto-Indo-European with secondary dispersal. Also of interest in this debate is Quentin D. Atkinson and Russell D. Gray, "How Old is the Indo-European Language Family? Illumination or More Moths to the Flame?," in *Phylogenetic Methods and the Prehistory of Languages*, ed. Peter Forster and Colin Renfrew (Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 2006), 91–110, which includes a summary of the two dating arguments.

³⁶ Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols. (Bern: Francke, 1948–1969). The dictionary is now in need of revision, but remains an important source. Gerhard Köbler has updated the material to include the laryngeal theory, and has added Tocharian and Anatolian data (Gerhard Köbler, *Indogermanisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed. (2000), <<http://www.koeblergerhard.de/idgwbhin.html>>.)

³⁷ Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1:429–434. This word-root is reconstructed in Proto-Nostratic as **gil-/gel-*, "to shine, to glisten" (Bomhard and Kerns, *The Nostratic Macrofamily*, 390).

³⁸ See the list drawn up by Jonathan Slocum in *Preliminary Indo-European Lexicon: Pokorny PIE Data* (Austin: Linguistics Research Center, University of Texas at Austin, 2007), <<http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/ielex/PokornyMaster-X.html>>.

the complementary Stage IV is considered, however, some of the five options presented in the routes numbered four to six above prove to be unlikely. Firstly, the widely occurring cognates of *yellow* in Indo-European languages suggest that the parent concept evolved before the break-up of the proto-language. By contrast, basic words for GREEN in the Indo-European language family are varied, so they are likely to have developed after Proto-Indo-European split into several daughter languages (see section seven, below). The GREEN basic concept developed in, for example, Germanic languages from a Proto-Indo-European root meaning "to grow," referring to plants, and it can, therefore, be assumed that plant-growth was the prototype for this category.

The information in the previous paragraph suggests that a basic *grue* category is unlikely in Proto-Indo-European, since a YELLOW category would seem to be of some antiquity, and the GREEN category would seem to have a prototype which excludes the colour blue. These considerations exclude the second option at number four, above (no early Y, and G/Bu at Stage IV), and number five (G/Bu at Stages III and IV). The two options at number six have also been excluded since that would involve no early Y category, and a Bu basic category developing before a G basic category. The evidence from, for example, Old English makes the latter development highly unlikely (see below). This leaves only Kay and Maffi's Trajectory C, which involves the development of a YELLOW category followed by a GREEN category.³⁹ Another possibility, not currently allowed for in the list of trajectories, is that PIE **ǵhel-* could have indicated a YELLOW + GREEN macro-category at Stage III, with the GREEN element later being removed to form an independent category based on the colour of plant-growth.⁴⁰

It is time for a recap of the suggested development of the earliest basic colour categories, but it should first be understood that it is almost impossible to judge when a mentally-registered colour category became basic. The early categories clearly took a long time

³⁹ Kay and Maffi, "Color Appearance," 749. Of the World Colour Survey's sample of 110 languages, 83 percent of them (ninety-one languages) follow Trajectory A, which has a Stage III–IV development of R/Y and G/Bu (III) to R, Y, and G/Bu (IV).

⁴⁰ The North American language Shuswap is the classic case of a YELLOW + GREEN category. See Robert E. MacLaury, "Color-Category Evolution and Shuswap Yellow-with-Green," *American Anthropologist* 89 (1987): 107–124. Kay and Maffi allow for a Y/G category at Stage IV which accommodates Shuswap and other Salishan languages, but presents an unlikely scenario for early Germanic languages (Kay and Maffi, "Color Appearance," 748).

to evolve, since people were not familiar with the concept of abstract colour. It is possible that a colour concept could have taken centuries to become basic under these conditions, gradually evolving towards an unrestricted and abstract usage. With reconstructed languages, there is no way to ascertain when full basic status was achieved by each colour term.⁴¹ With this caveat in mind, the situation in Proto-Indo-European will be reviewed.

It is likely that two of the many suggested word-roots for LIGHT/BRIGHT and DARK had become basic colour terms labelling basic categories before the emergence of Proto-Indo-European. If so, this would mean that the prototypes of DAY and NIGHT which had motivated the development of these concepts, had been replaced with abstract colour prototypes indicating what was regarded as the most typical areas of the two colours. It is possible that these were WHITE and BLACK, although BRIGHT is, perhaps, more likely for the former.⁴²

Judging by the speculative discussion above, a MACRO-RED category is likely to have evolved in Proto-Nostratic, based on the prototype of FIRE, but it may not have become basic until early Proto-Indo-European. When it became basic, its earlier prototype was also likely to have been replaced by the focal colour of the category. When this category later lost YELLOW (which may have included ORANGE), it was reduced to a category which can be described as RED+. This indicates that the category no longer represented MACRO-RED, which includes YELLOW, but was still considerably larger than our modern concept of RED, as it included, at least, areas of purple, pink, and brown. If the term used for this category in Proto-Indo-European was the ancestor of *red*, and this may well have been the case, since cognates of *red* are widespread in Indo-European languages, the word-root has been reconstructed as PIE **reudh-*.

⁴¹ The concept of gradually becoming more basic by satisfying more and more of the criteria was described by me (C. P. Biggam, *Blue in Old English: An Interdisciplinary Semantic Study*, Costerus New Series 110 (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1997)), and fully developed by Seija Kerttula in *English Colour Terms: Etymology, Chronology and Relative Basicness*, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 60 (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 2002).

⁴² Because of the large number of word-roots with meanings relating to brightness and darkness which appear in both Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Nostratic lists, it is particularly pointless to select one root for each concept and present it as a super-ordinate term. The wide range of non-cognate vocabulary for these two concepts in modern Indo-European languages offers no guidance.

Finally, PIE **ǵhel-*, as discussed above, probably indicated either YELLOW or YELLOW + GREEN, and may have arisen, at whatever date, through watching for the ripening of cereal crops, yellow representing the desired colour, and yellow + green representing the process of achieving it. Shields believes this word-root to have been basic in Proto-Indo-European, and this may well have been the case.⁴³

7. *Germanic GREEN*

Proto-Indo-European eventually split into several dialects which were to form the earliest representatives of what are today the Indo-European language families, such as Germanic, Celtic, Slavic, and others. The path which has to be followed in pursuit of the later English language leads via Proto-Germanic, which probably evolved between 1,000 and 500 BC. It is now believed that Proto-Germanic later divided into East Germanic and Northwest Germanic, and that Northwest Germanic later divided into the North Germanic branch (the Scandinavian languages) and the West Germanic branch. One branch of West Germanic later produced a collection of dialects known as North Sea Germanic, one of which was Old English.

In the previous section it was suggested that Proto-Indo-European acquired a basic category for YELLOW (or possibly for YELLOW + GREEN), and that the next acquisition, judging from the evidence of modern languages, is likely to have been a category for GREEN. It is interesting to note that the surviving linguistic record also supports a later date for the development of terms for GREEN than for YELLOW. While PIE **ǵhel-*, the meaning of which was probably centred on YELLOW, has a wide range of cognates across the Indo-European languages, many of the GREEN basic terms in those languages are not cognate. An obvious example is the contrast between modern Germanic words such as German *grün* and English *green*, and modern Romance words such as French *vert* and Spanish *verde*. This phenomenon provides a relative dating for the emergence of the GREEN basic category, suggesting it is younger than Proto-Indo-European since it evolved after the division of that language into several dialects.

⁴³ Kenneth Shields, "Indo-European Basic Colour Terms," *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 24, no. 2 (1979): 146.

As was mentioned above, Germanic words for GREEN are cognate with a word meaning “to grow,” and it is reasonable to suggest that the Proto-Indo-European concept of PLANT-GROWTH was ancestral to the new colour concept in Germanic languages. This is speculative, but it looks as if this prototype is the first to be unconcerned with human survival, and to be noticed solely because it contrasts with colours which are already mentally registered.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine which language ancestral to English was involved with the development and achievement of basicness for the GREEN category and its linguistic label. Old English *grēne*, “green,” appears to be a well-established basic term, so that status must have been achieved somewhere between Proto-Germanic and North Sea Germanic.⁴⁴ The oldest surviving records, of any respectable length, in a Germanic language are in Gothic, the principal representative of East Germanic. With some vocabulary, it is possible to see that a meaning occurring in later Germanic has not yet evolved in Gothic, and this adds to the relative-dating evidence. Unfortunately, the surviving Gothic texts, mostly biblical, are incomplete and not extensive, and an opportunity to include a word for GREEN does not occur.⁴⁵

8. Germanic GREY and Basic Colour Terms

It seems likely that a further category developed at some point between Proto-Germanic and North Sea Germanic, namely GREY. This category, and its basic term, have similarities with the GREEN category and its term, in that the Old English word *græg* “grey” is basic, but the ancestral root in Proto-Indo-European, namely **ǵher-*, is defined as “strahlen, glänzen, schimmern” (‘to gleam, to shine, to glitter’).⁴⁶ In other words, in the same period in which GREEN developed a hue

⁴⁴ It is not suggested here that the other branches of Germanic lacked this term and meaning. This paper is merely following the trail towards Modern English.

⁴⁵ There is no such word in Wright or Holthausen. (Joseph Wright, *Grammar of the Gothic Language...*, 2nd ed., with supplement to the grammar by O. L. Sayce (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954); F. Holthausen, *Gotisches etymologisches Wörterbuch mit Einschluss der Eigennamen und der Gotischen Lehnwörter im Romanischen*, Germanisches Bibliotek 1.4 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1934)). Some Gothic dictionaries on the internet include neologisms, and their sources should always be ascertained before use.

⁴⁶ Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1:441.

meaning and became a basic category, GREY developed an achromatic colour sense and also became basic.⁴⁷

It may seem surprising that a word for a dull colour like grey evolved from a BRIGHTNESS word. Pokorny reached his conclusion on the meaning of the Proto-Indo-European root by considering a range of cognates from related languages. While this word-root came to indicate GREY in several Germanic languages, it retains its early brightness sense in Lithuanian where it produced terms meaning "to glow, to sparkle" and "glowing coal." In various Slavic languages, cognates are defined as "red sky" and "sunrise." There are two observations worth recording about this situation. The first is to note that the large number of BRIGHTNESS word-roots which are reconstructable for Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Nostratic represent the earliest mentally registered element of colour, and it seems that many of them were gradually adapted in the descendant languages to express other aspects of colour such as hue. The etymology of many hue words in modern European languages, and perhaps others, is rooted in the concept of the bright daylight and sunshine which provided so many advantages for human survival.

The second observation is that the puzzling words which seem to have an involvement in both brightness and dullness, can often be interpreted as having had a close relationship with the concept of FIRE. While the Germanic GREY basic category emerged from an ancient BRIGHTNESS concept, the Old English word *brūn* is famous for apparently meaning both "brown" and "shining" at the same period (see section ten, below). Since every language has a larger vocabulary for subjects which are of importance to its speakers, I speculate that Proto-Indo-European had a generous supply of words connected with FIRE. This vocabulary would, no doubt, have increased with the invention of metal-working which began with copper-working around 7,500 years ago in Europe. If the ancestor of *grey* were a fire-related word, it could have gradually come to specialize in a particular product of fire, namely ash, and eventually developed the sense of "ash-coloured."⁴⁸

⁴⁷ The term **greisei-s* (greis, grau), "aged, grey," appears in Holthausen, *Gotisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 38. However, this is not attested in surviving Gothic records, but reconstructed from other Germanic records.

⁴⁸ Shields makes this suggestion in connection with the BRIGHTNESS root, PIE **ǵhel-*, which produced GREY terms in Celtic and Baltic. (Shields, "Indo-European Basic Colour Terms," 145–146).

Now it is time to recap on the supposed situation in the early Germanic dialects before the period of substantial Germanic immigration to Britain. The categories of BRIGHT/WHITE and DARK/BLACK would be well-established basic concepts. The basic terms used to denote them may not have been descendants of the earliest terms, since the great time-interval involved could have seen the loss of old basic vocabulary and the development of new. I am suggesting that the ancestor of *white* was already the Germanic basic term for BRIGHT/WHITE, since it survives as such in most modern Germanic languages, and the Old English equivalent denoted both brightness and whiteness. The Old Teutonic term is **χwītaz*.⁴⁹

The basic term for DARK/BLACK was probably **swartaz*, which is ancestral to German *schwarz* and English *swarthy*. In Continental Germanic languages today, *schwarz*-cognates are the normal basic terms for BLACK, so the change to *black* which occurred in English can be dated to a period after it had become relatively isolated from Germanic languages elsewhere.

The basic term for RED+ in the early Germanic dialects was **rauðo-z*, still denoting a larger area of the colour space than Modern English *red*. Also, most likely, well-established basic terms in the early Germanic dialects were **gelwa-*, “yellow,” **grônjo-*, “green,” and **grâego-* and **grâewo-*, “grey.”

9. Old English BLUE

At this point in the trail, the nature of the evidence changes and greatly improves, thus reducing the degree of speculation. The Germanic immigration to Britain, which increased considerably from the fifth century AD, brought a number of Germanic dialects to the Roman province, both before and after the severance of ties with the Empire. These dialects are only briefly glimpsed, from names and rare words, until the conversion to Christianity, starting in the seventh century, resulted in the production of written records of all kinds. A portion of

⁴⁹ The forms of the Old Teutonic words are taken from the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), unless otherwise stated, and the language name is theirs. The other word-forms quoted in the remainder of this section are contemporary. (*Oxford English Dictionary Online* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), <<http://dictionary.OED.com>>.)

these survive to the present, and provide historical linguists with data for the study of the dialects comprising Old English.

A wide variety of Old English texts is extant, although their random survival is unlikely to be accurately representative of the true textual output of Anglo-Saxon England. The types of text range across both heroic and religious poetry, and numerous prose genres. The latter includes works of literature, such as saints' lives and homilies, including the work of known authors like Ælfric and Wulfstan. There are also translations into Old English, some attributed to King Alfred, of several Latin works, both religious and secular. Other prose texts include letters, proverbs, prayers, laws, charters, chronicles, wills, king-lists and several minor genres. Colour vocabulary is particularly rich in poetry, medical works, wills, charters and place-names, and the rich vocabulary for concepts of LIGHT and BRIGHTNESS is common in most of the religious texts. In medical works, colour terms describe plants used in herbal cures, and, in wills, they describe the textiles and clothes to be bequeathed. The most colourful part of land-charters is the boundary clause, which describes, point by point, the boundary of the land involved in the gift or agreement, and this frequently involves the colours of the landscape. Related to these place-descriptions, but not necessarily occurring in charters, are English place-names originating in Anglo-Saxon times which include colour terms used of hills, rivers, fields and various plants.⁵⁰

While the existence, at last, of actual language in context is welcomed, this produces its own problems. First, it must be remembered that almost all surviving examples of Old English represent the language of an educated minority, rather than the normal spoken language which is the prime form for language studies. Secondly, although the criteria for defining basic colour terms, as discussed in section two, above, can be applied to the data from now on, they have been

⁵⁰ Particular instances of the use of Old English colour terms can be found in the *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* on CD-ROM, ed. A. Cameron, A. C. Amos and A. diPaolo Healey (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2008), and the *Oxford English Dictionary*. For place-names, see Carole Hough, "Colours of the Landscape: Old English Colour Terms in Place-Names", in *Progress in Colour Studies Volume 1: Language and Culture*, ed. C. P. Biggam and C. J. Kay (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006), 181–198. A complete list of occurrences of the Old English vocabulary for BLUE can be found in Biggam, *Blue in Old English*, 104, 114, 256–270, 285–287.

developed for use with *modern* languages, spoken by living people who can be questioned.

The main problem for historical semanticists is Criterion 4 of Berlin and Kay's primary criteria, which concerns psychological salience. As it stands, this requires the testing of native speakers, which is, of course, impossible with historical languages, so changes have to be made. I have replaced Criterion 4.1 (the tendency for a basic term to occur at the beginning of a list) with a tendency to have a high frequency of occurrence, relative to non-basic colour terms, in the surviving texts. Criterion 4.2 (stability of reference across informants and occasions of use) has been replaced with stability of reference across different types of text, such as poetry, administrative documents, religious texts and so on.⁵¹ Criterion 4.3 (occurrence in the idiolects of all informants) has been replaced with occurrence in various types of vocabulary, especially the learned and popular types. This last criterion is difficult to demonstrate because of the lack of popular language in the surviving corpus, but place-names provide an important source for such studies.

Two new colour categories were developing in Old English, and the first to be considered is BLUE. The vocabulary connected with this category has been studied at length, and it was found that *hæwe(n)* was clearly the dominant term. It has twelve times (thirty-six) the simplex occurrences of its nearest rival (*wēden* with three), and it has seven compound terms as opposed to none for *wēden*.⁵² If the independently occurring examples of *hæwe(n)*, in both simplex and compound terms, are added together, the total is forty-three, while the equivalent total for its nearest rival (now *blāwen*) is only six. Although the data is not extensive for any of the lexemes, it is suggested that the dominance of *hæwe(n)* is, nonetheless, undeniable. This does not necessarily mean, however, that *hæwe(n)* was a basic term, and all surviving occurrences of this lexeme have been studied to elucidate this point.⁵³ It was found that the word was monolexemic, was not a hyponym, was not narrowly contextually restricted, had a relatively high frequency of occurrence, and had stability of reference across types of text. *Hæwe(n)*,

⁵¹ For some historical languages, it is possible to consider the stability of reference across individual authors (the equivalent to the informants of living language studies), but there are too few individual authors writing in Old English whose work has survived.

⁵² Biggam, *Blue in Old English*, 289.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 115–270.

however, failed on the last criterion of basicness, namely, stability of reference across types of vocabulary. Although the slight nature of the evidence is freely admitted, it appears that the lexeme could be defined as “blue” in learned texts, but its meaning showed an even spread across BLUE, GREY and GREY-BLUE in popular vocabulary.⁵⁴ In terms of relative basicness, *hæwe(n)* had very nearly achieved full basicness in Old English, but not quite. It seems likely that this is why it was lost after the later influx of Norman French, in contrast to the truly basic Old English terms, which all survived into modern times.⁵⁵

A BLUE category had also been developing in Continental Germanic languages, but the term used to label it, in various cognate forms, was entirely different from the Old English choice. It was based on Old Teutonic **blāwo-z*, which gave rise to Old High German *blāo* and Old Norse *blár*. Old English also had a cognate term, *blāwen*, but it occurs so rarely in the extant records that it appears to have been approaching obsolescence. This difference in choice of vocabulary for the next category provides further relative dating evidence, suggesting that the BLUE category did not approach basicness on either side of the North Sea until after the geographical separation of Insular and Continental Germanic.

As for a category prototype, there are considerable difficulties in suggesting one. Pokorny includes *hæwe(n)* with descendants of a Proto-Indo-European root, **kei-*, which appears to indicate the concept of DARKNESS (“in Farbbezeichnungen, meist für dunkle Farben”).⁵⁶ The pre-modern Germanic cognates of *hæwe(n)*, as listed by Pokorny, denote the colour grey in the context of old age (Old Icelandic), the related concept of venerability (Old Saxon, Old High German), and, also, fine hair or down (feathers) (Old Icelandic). How could grey hair and feathers, probably also involving an element of white, provide a prototype for the category of BLUE? A possible explanation can be found in a suggestion made by De Vries.

De Vries offers a possible alternative word-root for this group of Indo-European cognates, suggesting PIE **(s)keu-*, “bedecken”

⁵⁴ Ibid., 254–255.

⁵⁵ It should be noted that equally thorough studies of other colour terms are required to establish their basicness and the probable period in which they achieved that status. Several Modern English terms such as *pink* and *orange* await rigorous investigation.

⁵⁶ Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1:540–541, s.v. 2. “**kei-*.”

(‘to cover’),⁵⁷ and the concept of COVERING can be seen as the parent sememe of hair covering the head, and feathers covering a bird. Many of the pre-modern Germanic cognates listed by Pokorny under *(s)keu- can be seen to be compatible with this interpretation. Examples include: Old Icelandic *skjā*, “a barn” (covering grain), *hā*, “skin, hide, membrane” (covering flesh), *skaun*, “a shield” (covering the body); Old High German *skugin(a)*, “a shelter”; and Old Frisian *skūle*, “a cottage, hut, shed” (covering people and/or possessions). Pokorny also includes in this group of cognates the Modern English term *sky*, which descends from an Old Norse term meaning “cloud.”⁵⁸ Many peoples believe and have believed that the sky is a covering stretched over the earth, and northern Europeans are more likely to have interpreted any such covering as consisting of clouds rather than an expanse of blue. Nonetheless, if CLOUDS had been the category prototype, it is easy to understand the close association of the colours blue and grey (and earlier white) in connection with *hæwe(n)*. So, although the reconstruction of the phonological development of *hæwe(n)* is controversial, there appears to be a logical semantic progression from COVERING to, for example, CLOUDS (EARTH-COVERING) to SKY-COLOURS (BLUE, GREY).⁵⁹ This hardly seems to deal with any compelling phenomenon vital for human survival,⁶⁰ so it is likely that, at this date, the idea of abstract colours was no longer strange, and new categories could simply have evolved from a noted contrast with already-existing categories.

10. Old English BROWN and Basic Colour Terms

The second colour category that was evolving amongst Old English speakers was BROWN, denoted by OE *brūn*. As mentioned earlier, this is the classic case of an Old English colour word denoting, apparently, both bright, glinting metal, and dark hues. The *Dictionary of Old English*

⁵⁷ Jan De Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 274, s.v. “hý.”

⁵⁸ The Old English cognate *scēo* is problematic but possibly has the same meaning.

⁵⁹ I suggested earlier that the colours of *hæwe(n)* could have derived from the concept of MOULD which can be found in several modern Germanic cognates (Biggam, *Blue in Old English*, 212). *Mould* is, of course, another COVERING-term, and should not yet be dismissed from efforts to explain the rise of the BLUE category.

⁶⁰ Of course, it is essential to avoid rotting food, and this was recognizable by colour, but this requirement dated from long before the early medieval period.

(*DOE*) gives a primary sense of “of a brown hue, dark-coloured; Latin lemmata indicate a colour range: brown, black, purple, red, dun.” A secondary sense is defined as “in poetry, of forged metal: traditionally interpreted as ‘shining, gleaming, burnished’; perhaps take as sense 1, referring to the appearance of oxidized iron.” The lexicographer, like many others before him or her, has found it almost impossible to accept that a single word could denote both *DARK* and *SHINING*, and has, therefore, tended towards an earlier suggestion that allowed early medieval sword-blades to be envisaged as dark. Hadley Tremaine suggested that *brūn* referred to the results of a surface treatment of metal which was used into modern times.⁶¹ The treatment involves a thin layer of oxidation (rust) being encouraged on the metal surfaces, which are subsequently polished. This produces a brownish colour on the metal, and the treatment is known as “browning.” While this may seem a reasonable explanation, it should be noted that the process is normally applied to firearms in order to prevent reflections dazzling the shooter, and to prevent his presence being signalled by such reflections to the enemy.⁶² This explanation is less convincing in an Anglo-Saxon context, where OE *brūn* is used of swords, helmets and a gouging-tool. Not only would the highest class of Anglo-Saxon warrior (the only group which could afford swords and/or helmets) be unwilling to conceal such status symbols, but any reflections into the eyes of the enemy in the hand-to-hand fighting implied by possession of a sword, could only be to its owner’s advantage. In any case, Tremaine’s argument is, presumably, irrelevant to a humble gouging-tool.

An earlier attempt to explain *brūn* was made by Warren Walker who explained that ironworking involves the heating of the metal until it can be worked, and this is followed by plunging the metal into, usually, cold water. A tempering process follows whereby the hardness and elasticity of the metal (both essential qualities) are fixed. Tempering involves further heating, followed by the final quenching. This latter process is absolutely crucial to the quality of the finished item, and modern processes judge the correct moment for quenching by precise heat measurement. Walker points out that traditional blacksmiths judge the correct moment by the colour of the heated

⁶¹ Hadley P. Tremaine, “Beowulf’s *Ecg Brun* and Other Rusty Relics,” *Philological Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (1969): 145–150.

⁶² Tremaine quotes extensively from R. H. Angier’s *Firearm Blueing and Browning* (Onslow Co., N.C.: Small-Arms Technical Publishing Company, 1936), 218–230.

metal, and that a brown colour would indicate the correct temperature had been reached.⁶³ This would not imply that the metal was brown in colour, but that the term *brūn* meant something like “best quality metal.”

While not dismissing Walker’s explanation, my own suggestion is that *brūn* originated, in Proto-Indo-European or earlier, as a FIRE word, just like OE *græg* and others, and that its semantics do indeed involve both BRIGHTNESS and DARKNESS. As has already been shown, early word-roots indicating LIGHT, BRIGHTNESS and FIRE could be semantically shifted towards other colour concepts. The early semantic BRIGHTNESS elements, however, were often remarkably persistent, and remained, though gradually diminishing, as part of the semantic portfolio of the descendant lexeme. Pokorny reconstructs the Proto-Indo-European root of *brūn* as **bher-* “glänzend, hellbraun” (shiny, pale brown), and observes that the root is often found in the names of brown animals, for example, in *bear* and *beaver*.⁶⁴ As a FIRE word-root, **bher-* could easily have encompassed the concepts of both BRIGHT and BURNED (scorched, singed, dark). Scorched items and cooked meat are typically brown in colour, and it would not be surprising if this prototype of SCORCHED MATERIAL had not only provided names for brown (scorched-looking) animals but also provided a colour prototype for a category comprising both brown and other dark warm colours, such as purple. Since this category included colour areas that would be considered inappropriate for Modern English *brown* to denote, it is best described as BROWN+. The colour term *brūn* cannot be considered basic if the BRIGHT sememe is accepted in poetic contexts, since this would involve a lack of stability of reference across types of vocabulary, namely, the use of an archaic sememe in poetry.⁶⁵

It is time to consider the basic colour terms that were available in Old English. A category of BRIGHT/WHITE was well-established and named with the basic word *hwīt*, but the complementary category of DARK/BLACK was in process of changing its basic term from *sweart*, cognate with other Germanic DARK/BLACK terms, to *blæc*. *Blæc* was already well-established by the time of surviving Old English texts: it

⁶³ Warren S. Walker, “The *Brūnecg* Sword,” *Modern Language Notes* 67 (1952): 519.

⁶⁴ Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1:136.

⁶⁵ *Brūn* has not been thoroughly investigated in the same way as *hæwe(n)*.

had varied referents, it is found in contrastive structures with *hwīt*, it translates Latin *niger* “black or dark,” and it had developed a range of connotations such as GLOOM, EVIL, and SIN. Such evidence of long-standing importance suggests that *blæc* began to challenge *sweart* soon after the migration period of the fifth century. This is an interesting phenomenon whereby a presumed basic colour term has been supplanted in English by an unrelated term which also became basic. The removal of a truly basic term is relatively rare, and worthy of research. It is clear from the later development of *sweart* into *swarthy* that it came to be associated with human skin and hair colour, but it was not so restricted in Old English. There is a distinct possibility that Old English had two basic colour terms for DARK/BLACK, just as Modern French has two basic terms for BROWN,⁶⁶ and Modern Russian has two basic terms for BLUE,⁶⁷ but this requires more research.

Old English still had a RED+ category, since it had no basic terms for PURPLE, ORANGE or PINK, and the basic term for that category was *rēad*. Other basic terms were *geolu*, “yellow,” *grēne*, “green,” and *græg*, “grey (greyish hue).” Investigation of *græg* has shown that, apart from its achromatic, modern sense, it could also denote dull hues. This would be the equivalent usage of ModE *greyish*, but *græg* required no suffix.⁶⁸ In this role, *græg* functions as a saturation term.⁶⁹ Finally, very nearly fully basic, but not quite, were *hæwe(n)*, “blue (grey),” and *brūn* “brown+.”⁷⁰

11. Middle English BLUE

The Norman Conquest of England in 1066 introduced Norman French as a prestige language,⁷¹ and this was, eventually, to have a significant

⁶⁶ Isabel Forbes, “The Terms *Brun* and *Marron* in Modern Standard French,” *Journal of Linguistics* 15 (1979), 295–305.

⁶⁷ Galina V. Paramei, “Singing the Russian Blues: an Argument for Culturally Basic Color Terms,” *Cross-Cultural Research* 39, no. 1 (2005): 10–38.

⁶⁸ C. P. Biggam, *Grey in Old English: An Interdisciplinary Semantic Study* (London: Runetree Press, 1998), 86–89. This contains a complete list of occurrences of the Old English vocabulary for GREY at pages 90–99, 241–271, 302–304, 311.

⁶⁹ A colour element which is concerned with purity of hue.

⁷⁰ The definition given here for *hæwe(n)* indicates that it has a significant secondary sense of GREY. The modern category of PURPLE was probably divided between RED+ (a vivid purple) and BROWN+ (a dark purple; violet).

⁷¹ Particular instances of the use of Middle English colour terms can be found in the *Middle English Dictionary* (Electronic version) (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2001), <<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>>.

effect on the basic term for BLUE in English: OE *hāwe(n)* was replaced with the French word *bleu*, which appears in various spellings. The process of word-replacement has been studied, as far as the often sparse records allow, and can be summarized here.⁷²

Curiously, *bleu* had the primary senses of “blonde, pale, unstained” in the eleventh- and twelfth-century records, but, in the thirteenth century, it appears in obviously blue contexts, and becomes the primary word for that concept in both Anglo-Norman and Middle English.⁷³ The Middle English version of *hāwe(n)*, namely, *hawe*, appears briefly as a type of cloth in the thirteenth century,⁷⁴ and in a probably Cumbrian poem of, most likely, the late fourteenth to early fifteenth century.⁷⁵ Thereafter, it disappears from England but remains in use in Scotland as Older Scots and Modern Scots *haw*, with regular, but not frequent, appearances in poetry. Its last recorded sighting is in *Mains and Hilly*, a novel of 1929 by James Alexander.⁷⁶

As *hawe* retreated northwards, *bleu* became more common in English and its BLUE sense appears to be well established by the late thirteenth century. It has been argued that its use in the cloth trade as a superordinate term for shades of blue in sample books of dye colours was an important element in the eventual predominance of this word.⁷⁷ It is also suggested that *bleu* probably became a basic colour term in the early fifteenth century, but that aspect needs more work.⁷⁸

⁷² C. P. Biggam, “Political Upheaval and a Disturbance in the Colour Vocabulary of Early English,” in *Progress in Colour Studies Volume I: Language and Culture*, ed. C. P. Biggam and C. J. Kay (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006), 159–179.

⁷³ *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, A-C, general ed. William Rothwell, ed. Stewart Gregory, William Rothwell, and David Trotter. 2nd ed. (London: Maney, 2005), s.v. “bleu;” Biggam, “Political Upheaval,” 163–165.

⁷⁴ Henry Thomas Riley, ed., *Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis: Liber albus, Liber custumarum et Liber Horn*, *Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores* 12, 3 vols. (London: Longman, etc., 1859–1862), 2:125.

⁷⁵ The poem, entitled *The Awntyrs off Arthur*, is edited by Thomas Hahn in *Sir Gawain: Eleven Romances and Tales*. (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1995). *Hawe* appears on p. 178, line 18. See also Biggam’s comment on Hahn’s translation of *hawe* (“Political Upheaval,” 166 n. 6).

⁷⁶ Cited in the *Dictionary of the Scots Language*, s.v. “haw.”

⁷⁷ Biggam, “Political Upheaval,” 170–173.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 169.

12. *Middle English BROWN and Basic Colour Terms*

While OE *hæwe(n)* was being replaced in most of England by ME *bleu*, OE *brūn* was not under threat because the Norman-French equivalent was *brun*, with a virtually identical pronunciation, and the primary sense of “dark, brown.”⁷⁹ Its relative basicness was actually strengthened by the foreign endorsement.

The Middle English basic colour categories and their terms can now be listed. There is a tendency for terms which had previously denoted both BRIGHT and WHITE to retain only one of these concepts in Middle English, and so the principal sense of ME *whīt* is WHITE. Middle English *blāk* has a primary sense of BLACK, but can still denote DARK, while *rēd* still indicates RED+.⁸⁰ *Yelwe* is defined as “yellow,” *grēne* as “green,” and *grei* as “grey,” although this last term can still denote a greyish hue. Both *bleu*, “blue,” and *brōun*, denoting BROWN+, are likely to have become basic in Middle English, but more precise dates remain to be ascertained.

13. *Modern English PURPLE, ORANGE and PINK and Basic Colour Terms*

The Old English adjective *purpuren* and related forms is tracked back as far as ca. 975 by the *Oxford English Dictionary*,⁸¹ but this is not what it seems. The Old English adjective was adopted from the Latin adjective *purpureus*, which, in turn, referred to the highly expensive textile known as *purpura*. Dodwell has shown that references can be found to *purpura* of various colours, such as red, white, black, and green, and this clearly indicates that, at this early date, the word was a textile term, not a colour term.⁸² The earliest surviving record of the adjectival *colour* sense in English occurs in John Trevisa’s translation

⁷⁹ *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* A-C, s.v. “brun.”

⁸⁰ The *Middle English Dictionary*, which has been consulted for all these definitions, assigns to *rēd* a primary sense of “red, of various shades of purple, crimson, scarlet, pink, etc.” (*Middle English Dictionary (Electronic version)* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2001), s.v. “rēd,” <<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med>>.)

⁸¹ OED, s.v. “purple.”

⁸² C. R. Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art: A New Perspective*, Manchester Studies in the History of Art 3 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982), 146.

of Bartholomeus Anglicus's *De proprietatibus rerum*, dated to some time before 1398, in a passage describing purple salt.⁸³

As can be seen from much of the above, the time between the development of a colour sense in a word and the achievement of full basic status can be immense. While there is a definite impression that the required time-span was shortening as each new basic term was acquired, it seems unlikely that any late medieval coining could become basic before the emergence of Modern English in the period from ca. 1500 onwards. This certainly appears to be the opinion of Klaus-Dieter Barnickel, who has done considerable research on the colour terms of Middle English, and who describes ME *purple* as one of "die Sekundärfarbwörter 1" ('secondary colour words first class').⁸⁴ *Purple*, therefore, became basic in Modern English, and the likely period when this status had been achieved for all speakers of the language needs to be ascertained by future research.

The earliest record of the word *orange* in English dates to before 1400, but this refers to the fruit. The colour sense of *orange* is first recorded from 1557.⁸⁵ This colour term is particularly interesting because of one of Berlin and Kay's secondary criteria for recognizing a basic colour term. They provided four primary criteria (see section two) for this purpose, but suggested four further criteria for cases which still remained doubtful. Present-Day English *orange* can be classified as basic from the primary criteria only, but, if this had not been the case, it might have fallen foul of Criterion 6: "Color terms that are also the name of an object characteristically having that color are suspect."⁸⁶ As with *purple* (and *pink*) the period when *orange* became basic needs to be ascertained.

Finally, we come to *pink*. The earliest recorded example of the colour use of this lexeme is dated to 1674,⁸⁷ and, at some period after this, it presumably achieved full basic status. I say "presumably" here because I personally have difficulty in regarding *pink* as basic, although I am probably not typical. I suspect I think of *pink* as a hyponym (subordinate term) of *red*, but my native speaker's instinct has been distorted by

⁸³ Reference from the *OED*, s.v. "purple," *a.* and *n.*, 2*a.*

⁸⁴ Klaus-Dieter Barnickel, *Farbe, Helligkeit und Glanz im Mittelenglischen: Bedeutungsstruktur und literarische Erscheinungsform eines Wortschatzbereichs*, Düsseldorf Hochschulreihe 1 (Düsseldorf: Stern Verlag Janssen, 1975), 88.

⁸⁵ *OED*, s.v. "orange," *A.n.* I.1*a* (the fruit); II.4 (the colour).

⁸⁶ Berlin and Kay, *Basic Color Terms*, 6.

⁸⁷ *OED*, s.v. "pink," *A.n.*⁵, III.5*a.*

researching colour vocabulary. The current *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*) definition, however, shows similar dubiety. Part of its definition is typical of a hyponym description: "...a pale red, sometimes with a slight purple tinge," while another part is of a valid form for intermediate colours which can constitute basic categories: "A colour intermediate between red and white..." A research project on *pink*, carried out across various age-groups, would be enlightening.

The basic colour categories and terms of Modern English can now be listed. First there is WHITE (*white*) and DARK/BLACK (*black*). It is still possible to use *black* for DARK, but this is almost certainly less common than in earlier times. The RED category, denoted by *red*, has been reduced from the earlier RED+ category, after the establishment of the basic categories of PURPLE, ORANGE, and PINK. The categories of YELLOW, GREEN, and GREY are denoted by *yellow*, *green*, and *grey*, and *grey* can still denote a greyish hue, but only just. The very tentative *OED* description of this usage suggests it is almost obsolete: "...composed of a mixture of black and white with little or no positive hue..."⁸⁸ The categories of BLUE and BROWN (no longer BROWN+ after the establishment of the PURPLE, ORANGE, and PINK categories) are denoted by *blue* and *brown*. Finally, the PURPLE, ORANGE, and PINK categories became basic, and are denoted by *purple*, *orange*, and *pink*.

14. Conclusion

The evolutionary sequence first postulated by Berlin and Kay in 1969, and frequently updated thereafter, is well-known, and has both supporters and detractors. In this paper, I have tried to use prototype theory, comparative evidence from modern languages, and relative dating from both linguistics and economic history. I have not tried in any way to support the evolutionary sequence, but my results are highly compatible with it. It would be most interesting to see further diachronic studies of the acquisition of basic colour terms in other languages, and suggestions for improving the research methodology employed here.

⁸⁸ *OED*, s.v. "grey," A. *adj.*, 1a.

Works Cited

- Angier, R. H. 1936. *Firearm Blueing and Browning*. Onslow Co., N.C.: Small-Arms Technical Publishing Company.
- Anglo-Norman Dictionary A-C. 2005. General editor, William Rothwell; ed. by Stewart Gregory, William Rothwell, and David Trotter. 2nd ed. London: Maney.
- Atkinson, Quentin D. and Russell D. Gray. 2006. How Old is the Indo-European Language Family? Illumination or More Moths to the Flame? In *Phylogenetic Methods and the Prehistory of Languages*, ed. by Peter Forster and Colin Renfrew, 91–110. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Barnickel, Klaus-Dieter. 1975. *Farbe, Helligkeit und Glanz im Mittelhochdeutschen: Bedeutungsstruktur und literarische Erscheinungsform eines Wortschatzbereichs*, Düsseldorf Hochschulreihe 1. Düsseldorf: Stern Verlag Janssen.
- Bellwood, Peter and Colin Renfrew, eds. 2002. *Examining the Farming/Language Dispersal Hypothesis*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Berlin, Brent and Paul Kay. 1969. *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Biggam, C. P. 2007. The Ambiguity of *Brightness* (with Special Reference to Old English) and a New Model for Colour Description in Semantics. In *Anthropology of Colour: Interdisciplinary Multilevel Modeling*, ed. Robert MacLaury, Galina Paramei, and Don Dedrick, 171–187. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 1997. *Blue in Old English: An Interdisciplinary Semantic Study*. Costerus, New Series 110. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
- . 1998. *Grey in Old English: An Interdisciplinary Semantic Study*. London: Runetree Press.
- . 2006. Political Upheaval and a Disturbance in the Colour Vocabulary of Early English. In *Progress in Colour Studies Volume I: Language and Culture*, ed. by C. P. Biggam and C. J. Kay, 159–179. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- . 2004. Prototypes and Foci in the Encoding of Colour. In *Categorization in the History of English*, ed. Christian J. Kay and Jeremy J. Smith, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series IV: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 261, 19–40. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bimler, David. 2005. Are Color Categories Innate or Internalized? Hypotheses and Implications. *Journal of Cognition and Culture* 5, no. 3/4: 293–347.
- Bomhard, Allan R. and John C. Kerns. 1994. *The Nostratic Macrofamily: A Study in Distant Linguistic Relationship*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Comrie, Bernard. 2002. Farming Dispersal in Europe and the Spread of the Indo-European Language Family." In *Examining the Farming/Language Dispersal Hypothesis*, ed. Peter Bellwood and Colin Renfrew, 409–420. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Corbett, Greville G. and Ian R. L. Davies. 1997. Establishing Basic Color Terms: Measures and Techniques. In *Color Categories in Thought and Language*, ed. C. L. Hardin and Luisa Maffi, 197–223. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crawford, T. D. 1982. Defining "Basic Color Term." *Anthropological Linguistics* 24, no. 3: 338–343.
- De Vries, Jan. 1977. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill.
- Dictionary of Old English: A to G* on CD-ROM. 2008. Ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, and Antonette diPaolo Healey *et al.* Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Dictionary of the Scots Language*. Dundee: University of Dundee. <<http://www.dsl.ac.uk/dsl/index.html>>.
- Dodwell, C. R. 1982. *Anglo-Saxon Art: A New Perspective*. Manchester Studies in the History of Art 3. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Forbes, Isabel. 1979. The Terms *Brun* and *Marron* in Modern Standard French. *Journal of Linguistics* 15: 295–305.
- Gimbutas, M. 1973. The Beginning of the Bronze Age in Europe and the Indo-Europeans 3500–2500 BC. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1: 163–214.
- . 1973. Old Europe c.7000–3500 BC, the Earliest European Cultures Before the Infiltration of the Indo-European Peoples. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1: 1–20.
- Goren-Inbar, Naama, Nira Alpersen, Mordechai E. Kislev, Orit Simchoni, Yoel Melamed, Adi Ben-Nun and Ella Werker. 2004. Evidence of Hominin Control of Fire at Gesher Benot Ya'aqov, Israel. *Science* 304, no. 5671: 725–727.
- Hahn, Thomas, ed. 1995. *Sir Gawain: Eleven Romances and Tales*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University.
- Hardin, Clyde L. 2005. Explaining Basic Color Categories. *Cross-Cultural Research* 39, no. 1: 83.
- Holthausen, F. 1934. *Gotisches etymologisches Wörterbuch mit Einschluss der Eigennamen und der Gotischen Lehnwörter im Romanischen*. Germanisches Bibliotek 1.4. Heidelberg: Winter, 1934.
- Hough, Carole. 2006. Colours of the Landscape: Old English Colour Terms in Place-Names. In *Progress in Colour Studies Volume 1: Language and Culture*, ed. C. P. Biggam and C. J. Kay, 181–198. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kay, Paul. 1975. Synchronic Variability and Diachronic Change in Basic Color Terms. *Language in Society* 4: 257–270.
- Kay, Paul and Luisa Maffi. 1999. Color Appearance and the Emergence and Evolution of Basic Color Lexicons. *American Anthropologist* 101, no. 4: 743–760.
- Kay, Paul and Chad K. McDaniel. 1978. The Linguistic Significance of the Meanings of Basic Color Terms. *Language* 54: 610–646.
- Kay, Paul, Brent Berlin and William Merrifield. 1991. Biocultural Implications of Systems of Color Naming. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 1: 12–25.
- Kay, Paul, Brent Berlin, Luisa Maffi and William Merrifield. 1997. Color Naming across Languages. In *Color Categories in Thought and Language*, ed. C. L. Hardin and Luisa Maffi, 21–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Kerttula, Seija. 2002. *English Colour Terms: Etymology, Chronology and Relative Basicness*. Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 60. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Köbler, Gerhard. 2000. *Indogermanisches Wörterbuch*. 3rd ed. <<http://www.koeblergerhard.de/idgwbhin.html>>.
- Lyons, John. 1995. Colour in Language. In *Colour: Art and Science*, ed. Trevor Lamb and Janine Bourriau, 194–224. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacLaury, Robert E. 1987. Color-Category Evolution and Shuswap Yellow-with-Green. *American Anthropologist* 89: 107–124.
- Michaels, David. 1977. Linguistic Relativity and Colour Terminology. *Language and Speech* 20, no. 4: 333–343.
- Middle English Dictionary (Electronic version)*. 2001. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. <<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>>.
- Mithen, Steven. 1994. From Domain Specific to Generalized Intelligence: A Cognitive Interpretation of the Middle/Upper Palaeolithic Transition. In *The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology*, ed. Colin Renfrew and Ezra B. W. Zubrow, 29–39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1996. *The Prehistory of the Mind: a Search for the Origins of Art, Religion and Science*. London: Thames and Hudson. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2007. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <<http://dictionary.OED.com/>>.
- Paraméi, Galina V. 2005. Singing the Russian Blues: an Argument for Culturally Basic Color Terms. *Cross-Cultural Research* 39, no. 1: 10–38.
- Pokorný, Julius. 1948–1969. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Bern: Francke.

- Renfrew, Colin. 1987. *Archaeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins*. London: Cape.
- Riley, Henry Thomas, ed. 1859–1962. *Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis: Liber albus, Liber customarum et Liber Horn*. Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores 12. 3 vols. London: Longman, etc.
- Saunders, Barbara. 1993. On the Concept of “Basic” in Berlin and Kay’s Basic Color Terms. *Antropologische Verkenningen* 12, no. 1: 35–50.
- Shields, Kenneth. 1979. Indo-European Basic Colour Terms. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 24, no. 2: 142–146.
- Slocum, Jonathan. 2007. *Preliminary Indo-European Lexicon: Pokorny PIE Data*. Austin: University of Texas at Austin. <<http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/ielex/PokornyMaster-X.html>>.
- Tremaine, Hadley P. 1969. Beowulf’s *Ecg Brun* and Other Rusty Relics. *Philological Quarterly* 48, no. 2: 145–150.
- Walker, Warren S. 1996. The *Brünecg* Sword. *Modern Language Notes* 67: 516–520.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1996. *Semantics: Primes and Universals*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, Joseph. 1954. *Grammar of the Gothic Language*....2nd ed. with supplement to the grammar by O. L. Sayce. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

THE LEXICON OF MIND AND MEMORY: *MOOD* AND *MIND* IN OLD AND MIDDLE ENGLISH¹

Ágnes Kiricsi
Károli Gáspár University, Budapest

The present article is a corpus study examining the semantic development of two English *mind*-words from the Old and Middle English periods. The analysis will focus on the question of how *mod*, the central Old English lexeme meaning “mind,” gradually changed its meaning to become Modern English *mood*, and how the Old English *gemynd* (Middle English *minde*)—at that time signifying “memory”—took the meaning of the Modern English *mind* sometime in the Middle English period. Recently, there has been quite a lot of interest in the Anglo-Saxon *mind*-vocabulary.² Nevertheless, this is the first study that aims at giving a comprehensive picture of the semantic development of these two words through 700 years of the English language, comprising Middle English, as well. In order to find out how these lexemes changed their meanings in this time-span, I compiled a tailor-made corpus of Old and Middle English texts during my research.

Guiding Principles for Building the Corpus

The guiding principles for the compilation of the corpus were manifold. On the one hand, for the Old English part, all the poetry was taken from the *Toronto Dictionary of Old English* (DOE) corpus.³ As

¹ This article is a revised part of my unpublished doctoral thesis: “The Semantic Rivalry of *Mod/Mood* and *Gemynd/Minde*” (Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, 2005).

² Malcolm R. Godden, “Anglo-Saxons on the Mind,” in *Old English Literature*, ed. Roy M. Liuzza (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 284–314; Antonina Harbus, *The Life of the Mind in Old English Poetry* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2002); Britt Mize, “The Representation of the Mind as an Enclosure in Old English Poetry,” *Anglo-Saxon England*, 35 (2006) 57–90; Michael J. Phillips, *Heart, Mind, and Soul in Old English: A Semantic Study*, unpublished PhD dissertation (University of Illinois, 1985).

³ Now *The Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form*, ed. Antonette di Paolo Healey (Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto, 2004), <<http://ets.umd.umich.edu/o/oec>>.

for the prose, the texts used were the Old English prose texts selected for the *Helsinki Corpus*.⁴ Whereas the *Helsinki Corpus* often includes only parts of these, however, my corpus used complete texts. Further sources were added from the Toronto prose material, on the principle that as many different text types, periods and dialects should be present as possible, ensuring both diachronic and diatopic coverage for my work. However, unnecessary duplication had to be avoided; for example, I did not include different—but mainly identical—manuscript versions of the same sermon or psalter gloss. Accordingly, from the *Lindisfarne Gospels* I included only Luke, from the *Rushworth Gospels* only Matthew, and from the *West-Saxon Gospels* only John, based on the selection in the *Helsinki Corpus*. Meanwhile, the number of homilies would be disproportionately large if all the surviving texts had been included. Therefore, a selection had to be made, keeping the balance of different homily types. The *Blickling* and *Vercelli Homilies*, representing the Gallican tradition, form about half of all the homilies in the Old English corpus; the homilies of Wulfstan and Ælfric, of the Benedictine tradition, constitute the other half. To keep this balance, all the twelve *Blickling Homilies* were included, as were all of Wulfstan's homilies.⁵ Of Ælfric's homilies, a selection was made based on that of the *Helsinki Corpus* and supplemented by homilies which seemed promising from the point of view of the two words examined.⁶ Of the supplementary collection edited by Pope,⁷ I included all the eighteen texts from the second volume, that is, from *Domenica V Post Pentecosten* to the addition to *Catholic Homilies* 44, "Paulus script ad Thesalonicensens," with the exception of the two last texts (the

⁴ *The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* (Helsinki: Department of English, University of Helsinki, 1991).

⁵ Although the Wulfstan canon is debatable, I followed Antonette di Paolo Healey and Richard L. Venezky, *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English* (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware, 1980). Thus, the following homilies (listed by their Cameron numbers) comprise the Wulfstan collection in my extended corpus: B2.1.1, B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4, B2.1.5, B2.2.1, B2.2.2, B2.2.3, B2.2.4, B2.2.5, B2.2.6, B2.2.7, B2.2.8, B2.2.9, B2.2.10, B2.3.1, B2.3.2, B2.3.3, B2.3.4, B2.3.5, B2.3.6, B2.4.1, B2.4.2.A, B2.4.2.B, B2.4.2.C, B2.4.3.

⁶ The Cameron numbers of those chosen are B1.2.2, B1.2.8, B1.2.11, B1.2.15, B1.2.27 and B1.2.29. Ælfric, "Ælfric's Second Series of 'Catholic Homilies': The Text and Manuscript Tradition," ed. Malcolm Godden (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1970); Ælfric, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series*, ed. Malcolm Godden, Early English Text Society, s.s. 5 (London: Kegan Paul, 1979).

⁷ Ælfric, *Homilies of Aelfric: A Supplementary Collection*, ed. J. C. Pope, 2 vols., Early English Text Society 259, 260 (London: Kegan Paul, 1967–1968).

addition to *De Auguriis* (*Lives of Saints* 17) and the passages from *De Virginitate*). None of the *Vercelli Homilies* are represented in the *Helsinki Corpus*, but for my analysis, seven were chosen to maintain the balance. Numbers four and seven (as numbered by Förster⁸ and the *DOE* corpus) were especially noteworthy because they contain the words examined.

Ideally, a corpus contains texts from all periods of the time-span to be studied, if possible spread evenly across the time-line. The *Helsinki Corpus* follows the traditional division (Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English), and, in addition, it further subdivides these three linguistic periods:

Table 1. The subperiods of the *Helsinki Corpus*

Subperiod	Years
OE1	–850
OE2	850–950
OE3	950–1050
OE4	1050–1150
ME1	1150–1250
ME2	1250–1350
ME3	1350–1420
ME4	1420–1500

In case of Old English, the four subperiods comprise one hundred years each. The decisive factor in grouping the texts in the *Helsinki Corpus* was always the date of the manuscript: it is often impossible to define the date of composition of early texts, and manuscripts are most often several steps removed from their originals; furthermore, in several cases the scribe made a dialect translation and used linguistic forms different from the original. Because of this, I followed the *Helsinki Corpus*'s method, but the *DOE* does not have this division,

⁸ Max Förster, *Die Vercelli-Homilien: I.–VIII. Homilie*. Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa 12. (Hamburg: Grand, 1932; reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964).

so the manuscript dates of the texts which I added to the *Helsinki* material had to be defined in order to be able to see the process and direction of the gradual semantic change. This was done by consulting the sources used by the compilers of the Toronto material, checking which manuscript version had been used and what the scholarly consensus is on the dating of the manuscript in question.

As no full corpus for Middle English prose is available, two corpora were used for my study. These are the *Helsinki Corpus* texts, which amount to roughly half a million words, more than seventy-five per cent of the corpus's Middle English material; and all the prose texts found in the *Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse*, a large collection of literary material from the period between 1100 and 1500, which constitutes the electronic full-text archive of the *Middle English Dictionary*, and is a part of the *Middle English Compendium*.⁹ This latter part of the *Compendium*, more precisely its prose texts, served as the basis for my research. For poetry, I used the *Chadwyck-Healey Individual Literature Collections*, also known as *Literature Online*.¹⁰ At the beginning of my corpus-building, I started out from the old version of the *Chadwyck-Healey Database*, where there were separate collections for medieval poetry, ballads, romances and drama. An updated version of the corpus has since appeared which does not treat ballads and romances separately; the two collections which formed the basis of my enlarged corpus as they appear in the current version of the database are *English Drama (1280–1915)*, from which my category of Medieval English Drama contains 248 individual plays, and *English Poetry (600–1900)*, from which my category of Medieval English Poetry—not including Anglo-Saxon Poetry—contains several hundred works by a total of fifty-eight authors.

As with the Old English material, I categorised all the works thus collected into the above mentioned subperiods of the *Helsinki Corpus*—ME1, ME2, ME3, and ME4 (Table 1)—in order to facilitate the tracing of changes of meaning. Furthermore, since the geographical distribution of the lexemes in the given centuries is an intriguing question, the dialects of the texts were defined, as well. In case of the material directly taken from the *Helsinki* collection, all the data needed were at hand

⁹ *The Middle English Compendium*, ed. Frances McSparran *et al.* (University of Michigan, 2006), <<http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/m/mec>>.

¹⁰ *Chadwyck-Healey Literature Collections* (1996–2009), <<http://collections.chadwyck.com>>, and *Literature Online* (1996–2009), <<http://lion.chadwyck.co.uk>>.

(along with other remarks on issues such as the age, social rank, sex of the author, text type, degree of intimacy of the relationship between the author and the audience, and the existence of any foreign original). In the instances where the text was taken from the *Compendium* or the *Chadwyck-Healey Database*, however, date and provenance had to be defined individually. In each case, the editions used by the compilers of the corpora were traced in order to find out which manuscript versions had been used in their database. Scholarship was then consulted for the definition of the date and provenance.¹¹ In a few cases, tracing the manuscripts and finding a scholarly consensus regarding the date and provenance was impossible. For the sake of accuracy, these texts were excluded from my corpus.

For precision of analysis, word-counts were needed. In my Old English Corpus, the total number of words in poetic texts is 177,833, whereas the prose part contains 1,039,999 words. The most precise list available is Peter Mielke's *DOE* corpus word-count list,¹² which contains all the works included in the Toronto corpus, arranged according to their Cameron Number. This list was later updated by separating the number of foreign words in the given texts from the Old English words. However, I could not see clearly what principles had been used in deciding what to call a "foreign word;" more importantly, there were surprisingly great differences between the numbers given by the original and the updated list, and neither of them proved to be accurate.¹³ Consequently, seeing the unreliability of the two word-counts,

¹¹ For example, Angus McIntosh, M. L. Samuels and Michael Benskin, eds., *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval England*, 4 vols. (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1986); henceforth *LALME*.

¹² Acquired from an email sent by Dr. Peter Mielke (peter@doe.utoronto.ca) to Dr. Matti Kilpiö (matti.kilpio@helsinki.fi) on 24 November 2001.

¹³ Taking, for example, *Genesis A, B* in George Philip Krapp, ed., *The Junius Manuscript*, Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 1 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931) (Cameron Number: A1.1), the old list gives 17,082 words altogether. The new list (intended to be more accurate than the old one), which was supposed to avoid foreign words, counts 20,242 Old English and 19 other words; this amounts to a large difference which cannot be accepted: the extra 3,179 words in the new list constitute an extra 18.6% more than the original number; on average the difference between the word-counts in the two lists is about ten percent. Some simple word-counts of my own showed that Mielke's original list could be preferred, as it is much more accurate (even though it does not separate the foreign words from the Old English ones).

I decided to avoid using either of them; instead I used simple percentages rather than frequency counts.¹⁴

Unfortunately, the lack of precise word-counts hinders research on the Middle English material, too. I consulted Christina Powell, of the University of Michigan, for the word-counts of the medieval texts of the *Chadwyck-Healey* corpus, and was informed that there are 4,505,407 words within the texts, including words that might occur within tags. This, however, is not enough data for frequency-counts, as there are no detailed word-counts for each individual work, which would support research on the level of dialectal distribution and the four subperiods of Middle English. Once again, without such bases for comparison, only percentages can be calculated, but even this has proved to be sufficient to allow us to follow the semantic change from century to century and from dialect to dialect.

Basic Meanings

The dictionary definitions of our two lexemes list an abundance of meanings. Even though the classifications of the *Oxford English Dictionary*¹⁵ and Bosworth and Toller's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*¹⁶ were consulted, their definitions often seemed to be arbitrary, and their taxonomy was detailed to such an extent that it only added to the difficulties of the analysis. Therefore, the corpus data were grouped into 'basic meanings.'¹⁷ In the case of *mod/mood*, these were EMOTIONAL MIND¹⁸ and RATIONAL MIND/SPIRITUAL SELF, whereas the examples for

¹⁴ During my research, I did make frequency counts, however, based solely on the *Helsinki Corpus*—a well-balanced with accurate word counts—and these can be found in Kiricsi, "The Semantic Rivalry", 107–177.

¹⁵ *Oxford English Dictionary, Online edition* (London: Oxford University Press, 2004), <<http://dictionary.oed.com>>.

¹⁶ *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of Joseph Bosworth*, ed. T. Northcote Toller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1882–98); T. N. Toller, ed. *Supplement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1908–21).

¹⁷ There has been a long discussion about what to call these 'basic meanings.' Perhaps the most accepted name at the current time is 'prototype.' I do not wish to dwell on these linguistic considerations, since the definition of the term 'prototype' itself and the summary of the debates surrounding prototype theory would fill volumes by themselves. Therefore, I employed my own term, 'basic meaning,' as I believe that this term is neutral and clear enough to be used freely and clear.

¹⁸ The 'basic meanings' will always be indicated by capital letters in this paper.

gemynd/minde were divided into MENTION, MEMORY and MIND (this latter in both rational and emotional senses). So, when examining *mod/mood*, the semantic field of mental processes was reconsidered in terms of emotional and rational features, as a shift in the frequency of meanings was expected in Middle English towards today's meaning "mood," which is essentially an emotional word. The shift in frequency for *gemynd/minde* was from basic meanings of MENTION and MEMORY to MIND, but in this case the further subdivision of MIND into rational and emotional categories was not attempted, since both are comfortably encompassed in the sense of the Modern English word. Still, before presenting the data, it has to be noted that the distinctions in basic meanings are not always clear-cut—especially in the case of *gemynd/minde*. Overlaps between the rational and the emotional were expected and found, and at times only a 'general reference to mental faculties' was established. As the main purpose was to examine how the emotional meaning supercedes all the others, the instances of general reference were listed under the meaning-group of RATIONAL MIND/SPIRITUAL SELF. Furthermore, as this ambiguous heading suggests, it is frequently impossible to decide whether the word refers to the human mind or the soul and inner man.¹⁹

Mod/Mood

The database contains a total of 2,273 instances of this lexeme, of which two-thirds of the material (1,492 occurrences) is from the Old English period, and one-third (781 occurrences) from Middle English.

Table 2 shows that *mood* stands for EMOTIONAL MIND in an increasing percentage, while there is a definite decrease for the meaning RATIONAL MIND/SPIRITUAL SELF. By ME4, we see that in only one out of ten cases does the lexeme carry its original meaning, while two hundred years earlier it was still four out of ten. The other interesting fact that we can note is the break in the process in OE3. There was a significant increase in the number of cases where *mod* was emotional in this period. The reason why this sudden growth is surprising is that

¹⁹ For further details on the division of these 'basic meanings' and what semantic field they cover, see Kiricsi, "The Semantic Rivalry," 118–140.

Table 2. Basic meanings of *mod/mood* in each period

Periods	Σ	EMOTIONAL MIND		RATIONAL MIND / SPIRITUAL SELF	
OE2	592	137	23.14%	455	76.86%
OE3	692	287	41.47%	405	58.53%
OE4	208	47	22.60%	161	77.40%
ME1	34	20	58.82%	14	41.18%
ME2	271	221	81.55%	50	18.45%
ME3	267	227	85.02%	40	14.98%
ME4	209	189	90.43%	20	9.57%

by OE4 this percentage had fallen by almost 20%, and then began to increase once again. What might be the reason for this?

OE3 is a subperiod in which *mind*-words flourish. For *mod* alone, there are 692 occurrences, constituting 30% of the entire *mod/mood* database. On the one hand, this is due to the increased occurrence of the word in philosophical writings, as the manuscripts of most of the Alfredian translations as well as, for example, Ælfric's homilies can be dated to this time. However, for Alfred, *mod* was most often the translation of *animus*, not often emotional, and was very frequently equated with the life-surviving spirit, and it was also used of an intellectual agency by Ælfric.²⁰ The reason why the emotional meaning of *mod* increases in spite of this rise in its use in the rational/spiritual meaning is that OE3 is the period of the manuscripts containing Old English poetic works. These poems conform to a different linguistic tradition, preserving old usages of some words and reaching back to deep layers of the language. *Mod* in the poetic tradition (or the "vernacular" tradition, as Godden²¹ calls it) was much more emotional than in the

²⁰ Kiricsi, "The Semantic Rivalry," 44–47.

²¹ Malcolm R. Godden, "Anglo-Saxons on the Mind," in *Old English Literature*, ed. Roy M. Liuzza (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 284–314.

learned tradition, or when compared to our own modern concept of the mind.²² The wilfulness of the concept of *mod* as it so often appears in poetic works, its independent nature, the fact that it has to be controlled, show that in Old English poetry it was not used predominantly to denote an intellectual agency. Most of the occurrences where the lexeme denotes “pride,” “arrogance,” “courage,” “anger,” or any of these clearly emotional overtones, come from poetry, which supports the existence of a separate vernacular tradition alongside the Latinate classical concept of the mind—a vernacular tradition that possibly goes back to ancient roots, where the mind was regarded not chiefly as an intellectual but as an emotional, active agency. This is further supported by the cognates of *mod*, which very often point towards a similar tradition. For example, Gothic *môþs*, *môd* means “anger” or “emotion,” Old Norse *móðr* means “anger” and “grief,” and even Old Saxon *môd* and OHG *muot*—both denoting “mind”—have the secondary meaning “courage.” Interestingly, this archaic emotional tendency in the meaning of the word is the one that returns in the lexeme’s new meaning in Middle English, and the classical concept of the mind lives on in *minde*, a word which was not at all loaded with such emotional qualities, and was the most rational of the dozens of Old English *mind*-words, one appropriate for the new concept of the mind. The analysis of the precise distribution and relative frequency of the *mind*-words distinguishing prose from verse would be an interesting enterprise; it is, however, outside the scope of the present study, and it will be seen that despite the problems of dating and register raised by the inclusion of poetic texts in OE3, the overall patterns for the changing semantics of *mind* from Old English to Middle English are fairly consistent.

Another fact worth mentioning is that, while in the *Helsinki Corpus* material there are no instances of the rational *mood* in ME4, in my enlarged corpus these do appear. Examples include lines 914–915 of the *Spiritus Guydonis*, usually attributed to William of Nassyngton, and lines 1037–1040 of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, both from the northern regions of England:

²² See also Ágnes Kiricsi, “The Passionate Mind and the Rational Heart: The Location of the Old English Mental Faculty,” in *Change in Meaning and the Meaning of Change*, ed. Matti Rissanen et al., Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 72 (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 2007), 1–34.

reches es more in þaire *mode* þan Crist god sun þat boght þam dere.
[riches are more on their minds than Jesus Christ, God's son, who
bought them dear] (*Spiritus Guydonis*)²³

...in ayre was hynged on hyght, þat meruayld all my *mode*; I loked &
saw bifer my syght lhesus þat dyed on rode.
[...was hung high in the air; it made my whole mind marvel; I looked
and saw before my sight Jesus, who died on the Cross] (*The Gospel of
Nicodemus*).²⁴

Surprisingly, however, besides the predicatable Northern occurrences of traditional usage in Middle English, there are some sporadic East Midland examples, too. *Octovian*, for instance, presents the following example, where one thinks in the *mode*—a definitely intellectual, rational activity:

The emperour thought euyr yn hys *mode*
The chylde was comyn of gentyll blode

[The emperor thought continually in his mind
that the child had come from gentle blood] (*Octovian*, ll. 1126–1127).²⁵

The significance of these examples lies in the fact that they post-date the latest appearances of this meaning given in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, by several decades. The *Oxford English Dictionary* gives Gower's *Confessio Amantis* ("If thou wolt take into thi *mod* Reson, thou myht be reson deeme That..." "if you will take Reason into your mind, though can judge by reason that..."), dated to 1390, and the *Destruction of Troy* ("For to mele with þat maidyn & hir *mode* here," "in order to talk with that maiden and hear her mind"), dated to ca. 1400. My data thus significantly extends the history of the use of *mode* in the basic meaning of RATIONAL MIND.

²³ Available at *Chadwyck-Healey Literatures Collections*. William of Nassyngton, *The Speculum vitae*, in *Englische Studien. Organ für Englische Philologie unter Mitberücksichtigung des Englischen Unterrichtes auf Höheren Schulen*, ed. Dr. Eugen Kölbing (Heilbronn: Verlag von Gebr. Henninger, 1884).

²⁴ Available at *Chadwyck-Healey Literatures Collections*. Adam Davy's 5 Dreams about Edward II. *The Life of St. Alexius. Solomon's Book of Wisdom. St. Jeremie's 15 Tokens before Doomsday. The Lamentacion of Souls. Edited from the Laud Ms. 622 in The Bodleian Library*, ed. F. J. Furnival, Early English Text Society, o.s. 69 (London: EETS, 1878).

²⁵ Available at *Chadwyck-Healey Literatures Collections*.

Gemynd/Minde

The total number of examples of this lexeme is 1604: 210 in Old English and 1394—many more—in Middle English. Of the 210 Old English examples, more than 50% can be dated to OE3 (950–1050). This is not surprising, as most of the Anglo-Saxon corpus, especially the manuscripts containing poetry, can be dated to this period. As for Middle English, more than 60% of the occurrences are from ME4 (1420–1500). The representation of ME1 is quite insignificant, with only five examples, due to the relatively small number of surviving English manuscripts from this period:

Table 3. Basic meanings of *gemynd/minde* in each period

Periods	Σ	MIND		MEMORY (with collocations)		MENTION	
OE2	58	1	1.72%	57	98.28%	0	0.00%
OE3	110	10	9.09%	95	86.36%	5	4.55%
OE4	42	1	2.38%	28	66.67%	13	30.95%
ME1	5	4	80.00%	1	20.00%	0	0.00%
ME2	61	21	34.43%	36	59.02%	4	6.56%
ME3	475	178	37.47%	268	56.42%	29	6.11%
ME4	853	440	51.58%	349	40.91%	64	7.50%

In most of the subperiods, there are attestations of the basic meaning MENTION, mostly through the expression *gemynd don/maken minde of*, as in “*þæs gemynd we dydon herbufan*” or “*þæs gemynd ic ær bufan dyde*,” which appears a couple of times in the Alfredian translation of Gregory’s *Dialogues*. This meaning is obviously close to MEMORY, as mentioning something involves remembering it and reminding others of it.

The most important aspect of MENTION is that it antedates the *OED* entry for *mind* in this meaning. While the *OED* puts it to the fourteenth century, its first appearance is in OE3 (950–1050), which is a difference of at least three hundred years. Interestingly, the second edition of the *OED* cites *Deo Gracias*, an occurrence from around

1325, as this meaning's first attestation, but the 2008 online version of the dictionary gives an even later appearance, an example from a psalter from around 1350.²⁶ However, it is certain that this meaning of *gemynd/minde* did not evolve during Middle English, but was already quite frequent in the Old English period.²⁷ I give two examples where *gemynd* appears in the sense of MENTION in the expression *gemynd don*. This is a calque, appearing in glosses of Latin *mentionem facere*, which also appears, alongside *memoriam facere*, in the Latin originals of the Old English texts where *gemynd don* appears. I quote first the Latin original and then the Old English translation for each:

Gregorius. Adhuc pauca aliqua, quae de Bonifati episcopi opere supersunt, quia eius *memoriam fecimus*, exequamur.²⁸

[GREGORY. For as much as we have now *made mention* of Bonifacius, let us prosecute a few more of his acts, not yet spoken of.]²⁹

Gregorius him andswarode: nu gyt hwylcehugu wisan wæron to lafe, þa we willaþ spreca be Bonefacies weorce þæs biscopes, þæs *gemynd* we *dydon* herbufan.³⁰

[Gregory replied to him: now there were still some matters left which we wish to speak of, concerning the work of Bishop Boniface, of which we have made mention above.]

Frater quoque Valentiniani eius monachi, cuius superius *memoriam feci*, vir erat laicus, sed religiosus.³¹

[A brother also of Valentinian the monk, of whom I *made mention* before, was a layman, but devout and religious.]³²

²⁶ The OED Online: "c1350 Psalter (BL Add.) in K. D. Bülbring Earliest Compl. Eng. Prose Psalter (1891) cx. 4 Our Lord pitiful & merciful made minde of his wondres."

²⁷ For further examples, see the Bosworth and Toller, *Supplement*, under the heading "gemynd."

²⁸ Gregory the Great, *Gregorii Magni Dialogi, libri IV*, ed. Umberto Moricca, Fonti per la storia d'Italia, scrittori 6 (Rome: Tipografia del senato, 1924), bk 1, ch. 9, p. 53.

²⁹ Translation from <http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/gregory_01_dialogues_book1.htm>. Online version on the basis of Gregory the Great, *Gregory the Great: Dialogues*, ed. Edmund G. Gardner (London: Philip Lee Warner, 1911).

³⁰ Available at *Chadwyck-Healey Literatures Collections*.

³¹ Gregory the Great, *Gregorii Magni Dialogi*, bk 2, ch. 13, p. 99.

³² Translation from <http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/gregory_01_dialogues_book2.htm>. See note 32.

Eac Ualentinianes broðor Benedictes munukes, þæs *gemynd* ic ær bufan *dyde*, se wæs læwede wer, ac he wæs swyðe eawfæst.³³

[Also the brother of Valentinian, a monk of Benedict's, of whom I previously made mention above, who was a layman, but was very devout.]

Our evidence also presents a substantial change in the relative frequencies of the basic meanings of *gemynd/minde* between Old and Middle English. While before the mid-twelfth century there are only a few instances of *gemynd* meaning MIND, the numbers increase in the following centuries. In contrast to the twelve examples in Old English, Middle English presents 640. Looking at the data in relative terms, the percentages indicate how the word started to broaden its semantic field towards denoting the mental faculty (37.47% by the mid-fourteenth century and more than 50% in the mid-fifteenth). The place where the tendency seems to break down is the period between 1050 and 1250, where the surviving number of examples is so small that it cannot serve as statistically meaningful data.

Moreover, in the Middle English period, especially its later subperiods, when the word *minde* appears meaning MEMORY, it occurs mostly in collocations—collocations which may be petrified expressions, reflecting a usage earlier than that of the period in which they appear. Some of the most important Middle English expressions preserving the notion of “memory” are: *beren in minde*, *bringen unto/into minde*, *bringen oute of minde*, *callen unto minde*, *comen to minde*, *drauen into minde*, *haven minde of*, *kepen in minde*, *time oute of minde*, *holden in/on minde*, *passen oute of minde*, *from/of/oute of minde*, *fallen in/into/oute of minde* and *ben out of minde*. These collocations tend to fix and fossilise an earlier usage; moreover, in their Modern English reflexes, the reference of *mind* is probably usually understood synchronically as a metaphorical reference to the mental faculty rather than to memory as such, and this may also have been the case in Middle English.

Since the primary aim of this study is to examine how the the relative frequencies of the basic meanings of the words under study change, it is only worth taking into consideration those instances where the word is used independently to denote MEMORY, not those in collocations. Therefore, all these fossilised expressions were disregarded in the following calculations of the relative frequencies of *gemynd/*

³³ Available at *Chadwyck-Healey Literatures Collections*.

minde's different meanings. For the sake of easy comparison, fixed Old English collocations that had become obsolete by the Middle English period were treated separately, since I was interested in eliminating those expressions that determine Middle English collocational restrictions. In such Old English examples, *gemynd* stands mostly together with the following verbs: *afæstnian to*, *niman*, *begietan*, and *lætan*. These instances have not been grouped under a separate heading: they are treated together with the Old English occurrences where the word stands outside collocations.

Without treating these fossilised forms separately, the percentages for *minde* denoting MEMORY remain relatively stable during Middle English; moreover, it appears in almost every century in a much higher proportion than the meaning MIND. However, if we subtract the collocations from the occurrences of *gemynd/minde* with the meaning MEMORY, it emerges that, whereas in Old English the word mostly denotes MEMORY, all through the Middle English period *minde* mostly stands for MIND. As Table 4 shows when compared with Table 3, in ME2 more than 63% of simple examples imply the mental faculty, as opposed to the 34.43% of examples including collocations; in ME3 it is 77.06% instead of 37.47%; and finally, in ME4, it rises to more than 80%, rather than 51.58%. In the cases where *gemynd/minde* signifies MEMORY outside collocations, then, there is a steady and conspicuous decline, from 54.84% of examples of *gemynd* denoting recollection in the eleventh century to 7.69% by the fifteenth.

Table 4. Basic meanings of *gemynd/minde* in each period
(without collocations)

Periods	Σ	MIND		MEMORY (without collocations)		MENTION	
OE2	50	1	2.00%	49	98.00%	0	0.00%
OE3	89	10	11.24%	74	83.15%	5	5.62%
OE4	31	1	3.23%	17	54.84%	13	41.94%
ME1	4	4	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ME2	33	21	63.64%	8	24.24%	4	12.12%
ME3	231	178	77.06%	24	10.39%	29	12.55%
ME4	546	440	80.59%	42	7.69%	64	11.72%

This is not to dismiss the importance of collocations entirely, however: as Table 5 shows, as we proceed in time, the occurrences of *gemynd/minde* meaning MEMORY appear more and more often in collocations, reaching around 90% by ME4, from under 15% in OE2, signalling that in nine out of ten cases it is only in fossilised expressions that the word preserves the old meaning. The only time where the growth seems uneven is ME1, but this is due to the fact that there is only one occurrence of the word in this meaning in this period. This indicates that collocations have a distinctive role in the semantic history of *gemynd/minde*.

Table 5. *gemynd/minde* as MEMORY in each period, within and outside of collocations

Periods	Σ	MEMORY (collocations)		MEMORY (no collocations)	
OE2	57	8	14.04%	49	85.96%
OE3	95	21	22.11%	74	77.89%
OE4	28	11	39.29%	17	60.71%
ME1	1	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
ME2	36	28	77.78%	8	22.22%
ME3	268	244	91.04%	24	8.96%
ME4	349	307	87.97%	42	12.03%

Memorie and Remembraunce

Having established the chronology of the semantic changes concerning *gemynd/minde*, it is now possible to ask what could have triggered the process. There are significant turning points in the history of these words, which emerge in the fourteenth century. This age was linguistically a busy one, shortly before the process of standardisation began in the English language. The linguistic consequences of the Norman Conquest are already quite visible, with a huge percentage of French loanwords in the vocabulary. A considerable dialectal variety had developed, making the language very diversified. Both the inflectional system and the conjugation of the verbs had significantly simplified, and several common Germanic characteristics of English had dis-

appeared or remained in a vestigial form. It seems that the lexemes studied here were involved in this linguistic turmoil, too. Sometime in the 1300s, *minde* started losing its “basic meaning” of MEMORY and called its troops to retreat from the semantic battlefield. This change in the relative frequencies of the basic meanings, however, did not just concern these two words of Germanic origin. Apparently, external influence contributed significantly to the process, too, in the form of two new words arriving from the other side of the Channel that penetrated the language step by step. These are *memorie* and *remembraunce*, the French loans, which were gradually gaining ground at the time when *minde* was losing it. During the corpus analysis, these two words were examined, as well; the corpus contains 317 occurrences of *memorie* and 573 occurrences of *remembraunce*.

Table 6. A comparison of the occurrence of *minde* (without collocations, in the basic meaning MEMORY), *memorie* and *remembraunce* in Middle English

Periods	Σ	<i>minde</i> as MEMORY (without collocations)		<i>memorie</i>		<i>remembraunce</i>	
ME2	13	8	61.54%	3	23.08%	2	15.38%
ME3	163	24	14.72%	36	22.09%	103	63.19%
ME4	788	42	5.33%	278	35.28%	468	59.39%

Table 6 shows *minde* starting to lose ground as compared to the loan-words. While it is still at 62% in ME2, it drops to 5% by ME4, in the late fifteenth century. This means that, while *memorie* and *remembrance* were used for denoting the recollecting faculty or the act of remembering in 38% of cases in ME2, this percentage had increased to 95% in ME4, only about 150 years later.

The ‘Basic Meaning’ MIND

We have seen that in the course of Middle English, *mod/mood* gradually lost its meaning MIND, while *gemynd/minde* slowly took its place and became the basic lexeme referring to the mental faculties. For the Middle English period, there were 767 examples where either *mood* or *minde* stood for the mental faculty. For Old English, the sum is even

greater, totalling 1,033—and of the total of 1,033 instances where the text refers to the mental faculty, only twelve use *gemynd*; in all the other cases, it is *mod*. Of these twelve examples, ten occur in OE3 (950–1050), but even these amount only to 2.41% of references to mental faculties in the subperiod. Furthermore, if we take the full range of Old English *mind*-words into consideration,³⁴ we can conclude that this is a very insignificant number. All the same, the attestations do signal the word's tendency to broaden its semantic field towards its later meaning. The transitional period, however, is the end of the fourteenth century: in ME1 and ME2, *mood* dominates the denotation of MIND over *minde* (with over 70% of occurrences), but after the huge change in ME3, *mood*'s proportion falls to 4.35% (as against 95.65% for *minde*) in ME4. This switch in dominance comes at the end of the fourteenth century, with a 4.4 : 1 ratio in favour of *minde*.

Table 7. The basic meaning MIND in each period

Periods	Σ	<i>gemynd/minde</i>		<i>mod/mood</i>	
OE2	456	1	0.22%	455	99.78%
OE3	415	10	2.41%	405	97.59%
OE4	162	1	0.62%	161	99.38%
ME1	18	4	22.22%	14	77.78%
ME2	71	21	29.58%	50	70.42%
ME3	218	178	81.65%	40	18.35%
ME4	460	440	95.65%	20	4.35%

If we examine at the sum of the words in each subperiod, we can see that the number is very high in OE2 (456) and OE3 (415), then declines in OE4 (162), gets even lower in ME1 (eighteen), and remains

³⁴ These words are as follows: *andgit*, *breastcearu*, *breost*, *breostbedern*, *breostcofa*, *breostgeðanc*, *breosthord*, *breosthyge*, *breostloca*, *breostsefa*, *ferhð*, *ferhðsefa*, *ferhþcleofa*, *ferhþcofa*, *ferhþloca*, *ferhþsefa*, *gast*, *gastcofa*, *gearowita*, *(ge)hygd*, *gemynd*, *geþanc*, *geþoht*, *gewitloca*, *(ge)witt*, *heorte*, *heortscraef*, *hordcofa*, *hordgeþanc*, *hreder*, *hreþcofa*, *hreþerloca*, *hyge*, *hygesceaft*, *incofa*, *ingehygd*, *ingemynd*, *ingepanc*, *lichord*, *mod*, *modgemynd*, *modgeþanc*, *modgeþoht*, *modhord*, *modsefa*, *myne*, *orþanc*, *sawol*, *se innra man*, *sefa*.

low in ME2 (71), until it starts increasing in ME3 (218) to arrive at a very high number again in ME4 (460). Certainly, the time between the mid-eleventh and the late thirteenth centuries was a historically turbulent era, which—due to Norman dominance—is not as heavily represented in English language manuscripts as the times preceding and following it. However, even disregarding this fact, we can say that the interest in the mind and the use of relevant vocabulary was more characteristic of the centuries before and after this period. If we look at the individual works coming down to us from OE2, it comes as no surprise that we face an abundance of *mod*, because this was the time when the manuscripts containing the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* and the similarly Alfredian *Boethius* and *Cura Pastoralis* translations were born, works with an increased interest in the mind. Similarly, as mentioned above, OE3 includes other very significant manuscripts with a heightened interest in philosophy, such as the Old English translation of Gregory's *Dialogues*, and the *Blickling*, *Vercelli* and *Ælfric's* homilies. Later, in ME4, the growing interest in philosophical issues is signalled by the appearance of the mystics. These writings, together with other moralising literature (e.g., morality and mystery plays) characteristic of this period, the manuscripts of which can be dated back to the later fifteenth century, are the source of a large number of *minde*-expressions.³⁵

This chronological account can be refined, for the Middle English period, by examining the dialectal distribution of the forms. For this, all the Middle English sources used were defined by their dialectal provenance, as well as their chronological sub-periods. Overall, each dialect tells the same story: in every dialectal area, there is a decisive shift between ME2 and ME3, *mood* winning out: from an average of 69.96% against *minde's* average 30.04% in ME2, in the next subperiod it is *minde* winning out, with an average of 84.58%, with *mood's* average only 15.42%.³⁶ By the second half of the fifteenth century—in

³⁵ For a comprehensive study on *why* the semantic change of *mod/mood* and *gemynd/minde* happened, see: Kiricsi, "The Semantic Rivalry," 177–198, and Ágnes Kiricsi, "From *Mod* to *Minde*—Report from a Semantic Battlefield," in *What does it Mean*, ed. Kathleen E. Dubs (Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Catholic University, 2003–2004), 217–239.

³⁶ The exception is East Midland in ME1, where there are only three occurrences of the meaning MIND, all of which are denoted with the lexeme *minde*, with no examples of *mood* in such meaning. Due to the relatively low number of examples (eighteen altogether), however, ME1 cannot be regarded as a well-represented period.

every dialect—all or almost all cases show that the mental faculty is denoted by the new word. The Northern dialect is the most conservative, with the rate as low as nine out of ten instances using the new word, with *mood* preserving its original meaning in slightly more than 9% of the cases.

Table 8. A comparison of the basic meaning MIND in the different dialects

Periods	KENT		SOUTHERN		EAST-MIDLAND		WEST-MIDLAND		NORTHERN		SCOTS	
	<i>mood</i>	<i>minde</i>	<i>mood</i>	<i>minde</i>	<i>mood</i>	<i>minde</i>	<i>mood</i>	<i>minde</i>	<i>mood</i>	<i>minde</i>	<i>mood</i>	<i>minde</i>
ME1	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%	66.67%	33.33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
ME2	0%	0%	75%	25%	71.43%	28.57%	61.54%	38.46%	71.88%	28.13%	0%	0%
ME3	0%	0%	7.14%	92.86%	12%	88%	33.96%	66.04%	24.00%	76.00%	0%	100%
ME4	0%	100%	0%	100%	3.35%	96.65%	0%	100%	9.15%	90.85%	0%	100%

The corpus study has thus proved that there were gradual and easily observable changes in the meanings that *mod/mood* and *gemynd/minde* covered. As we have seen, the lexeme *mod/mood* started becoming overwhelmingly emotional in meaning in the thirteenth century (ME3), but we must not forget about the Old English vernacular tradition, where the mental faculty—as it appears mostly in poetic texts—carried emotional overtones, too. Parallel with this, the word's other basic meaning, RATIONAL MIND/SPIRITUAL SELF, was retained in the North, but even there it was mostly *minde* that stood for the mental faculty from ME3 (the second half of the fourteenth century) on. A similar process happened to *gemynd/minde* as to the other word. At the same time as *mod/mood* started to lose its old meaning, *gemynd/minde* started to lose its basic meaning of MEMORY, too, and denoted MIND more and more often. The old meaning was predominantly retained in the Northern dialect.

Language is not an autonomous entity, since it is constantly under the influence of an intricately intertwined system of intra- and extra-linguistic factors. From this point of view, the study of an abstraction, such as the seat of human cognitive, intellectual and emotional powers, proves to be particularly fruitful. The changes described here are generalised views of generalised processes, stereotyped understandings of the concept of the mind in different periods of medieval England.

Even though these stereotypes do obtain, we must not forget about the individual. Every person's understanding of this abstract entity must have been shaped by his or her individual experience and world-view. Tendencies can be discovered by various linguistic and literary methods; we can study changes on the grass-roots level or from a global perspective. Each and every method will bring us closer to a fuller understanding. However, we must keep it in mind that what has been depicted here from the distance of five hundred years or even a millennium is a unity shaped by a variety of individuals, however paradoxical that may sound.

Works Cited

Editions and secondary literature

- Ælfric. 1967–1968. *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*. Ed. J. C. Pope, Early English Text Society 259, 260, 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul.
- . 1970. Ælfric's Second Series of 'Catholic Homilies': The Text and Manuscript Tradition. Ed. Malcolm Godden. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Cambridge University.
- . 1979. *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies*. Ed. Malcolm Godden, Early English Text Society, s.s. 5. London: Kegan Paul.
- Baugh, Albert C. and Thomas Cable. 1993. *A History of the English Language*. London: Routledge.
- Dobbie, Elliot. 1942. *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*. Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 6. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Förster, Max. 1932. *Die Vercelli-Homilien: I.–VIII. Homilie*. Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa 12. Hamburg: Grand. Reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.
- Furnival, Frederick J., ed. 1878. *Adam Davy's 5 Dreams about Edward II. The Life of St. Alexius. Solomon's Book of Wisdom. St. Jeremie's 15 Tokens before Doomsday. The Lamentacion of Souls. Edited from the Laud Ms. 622 in The Bodleian Library*. Early English Text Society, o.s. 69. London: EETS.
- Godden, Malcolm R. 2002. Anglo-Saxons on the Mind. In *Old English Literature*, ed. Roy M. Liuzza, 284–314. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Gregory the Great. 1911. *Gregory the Great: Dialogues*. Ed. Edmund G. Gardner. London: Philip Lee Warner. *The Tertullian Project*. <<http://www.tertullian.org>>.
- . 1924. *Gregorii Magni Dialogi, libri IV*. Ed. Umberto Moricca, Fonti per la storia d'Italia, scrittori 6. Rome: Tipografia del Senato.
- Harbus, Antonina. 2002. *The Life of the Mind in Old English Poetry*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Healey, Antonette di Paolo and Richard L. Venezky. 1980. *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English*. Newark: University of Delaware.
- Herzfeld, George, ed. 1900. *An Old English Martyrology*. Early English Text Society o.s. 116. London: Kegan Paul, Trech, Trübner. Reprinted 1973.
- Kiricsi, Ágnes. 2003–2004. From *Mod* to *Minde*—Report from a Semantic Battlefield. In *What does it Mean*, ed. Kathleen E. Dubs, 217–239. Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Catholic University.
- . 2007. The Passionate Mind and the Rational Heart: The Location of the Old English Mental Faculty. In *Change in Meaning and the Meaning of Change*. Ed. Matti Rissanen et al., Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 72, 1–34. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- . 2005. *The Semantic Rivalry of Mod/Mood and Gemynd/Minde*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem.
- Krapp, George Philip, ed. 1931. *The Junius Manuscript*. Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 1. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Krapp, George Philip and Elliot Dobbie, eds. 1936. *The Exeter Book*. Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 3. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McIntosh, Angus, M. L. Samuels, and Michael Benskin, eds. 1986. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval England*. 4 vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
- Mize, Britt. 2006. The representation of the mind as an enclosure in Old English poetry. *Anglo-Saxon England* 35: 57–90.
- Oxford English Dictionary, Online edition*. 2004. London: Oxford University Press. <<http://dictionary.oed.com>>.

- Phillips, Michael J. 1985. *Heart, Mind, and Soul in Old English: A Semantic Study*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Illinois.
- Skeat, Walter W., ed. 1871–1887. *The Four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toller, T. Northcote, ed. 1882–98. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of Joseph Bosworth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toller, T. Northcote, ed. 1908–21. *Supplement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- William of Nassyngton. 1884. *The Speculum vitae, in Englische Studien. Organ für Englische Philologie unter Mitberücksichtigung des Englischen Unterrichtes auf Höheren Schulen*. Ed. Dr. Eugen Kölbing. Heilbronn: Verlag von Gebr. Henninger.

Electronic Corpora

- Chadwyck-Healey Literatures Collections. 1996–2009. <<http://collections.chadwyck.com>>.
- The Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form*. 2004. Ed. Antonette di Paolo Healey. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto. <<http://ets.umd.umich.edu/o/oec>>.
- The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*. 1991. Helsinki: Department of English, University of Helsinki.
- Literature Online*. 1996–2009. <<http://lion.chadwyck.co.uk>>.
- The Middle English Compendium*. 2006. Ed. Frances McSparran *et al.* University of Michigan. <<http://ets.umd.umich.edu/m/mec>>.

ANOTHER SUBORDINATOR, AN'T PLEASE YOU: A DIACHRONIC STUDY OF CONDITIONAL AND

Alexandra Fodor*
University of Helsinki

1. *Introduction*

Research into conditional clauses is by no means an entirely new topic, but there remain areas which have been little discussed. One of these is the conditional use of the originally coordinating conjunction *and* in the history of English: in some texts from earlier periods, there are cases where instead of the regular conditional conjunction *if*, it was the conjunction *and* that was used. Despite the fact that this usage “has been widely commented on by philologists and historians of English,” its origins and rise have received little close analysis.¹ The aim of this article is to reveal more about conditional *and*: how frequently it occurred, whether there is any specific context where its use was more prevalent, and in what kinds of conditional structure it was used most often. These questions are tackled through the analysis of two corpora, one of Middle English and one of Early Modern English, namely the *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2)* and the *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (PPCEME)*. Primary text references in this article are to these corpora; I cite the ultimate sources of the texts in the appendix.

The article begins with some background information concerning the origin and the lifespan of conditional *and*. Section three discusses the research aims and my methods and their application. The analyses of the two corpora are undertaken in section four, and my concluding remarks can be found in section five. I argue that the two corpora reveal the whole history of *and* as a conditional subordinate conjunction, from its appearance, through its increasing frequency in the Middle English period, to its decline and almost complete extinction in Early Modern English.

* I gratefully acknowledge the valuable help of Dr Alaric Hall.

¹ Janel M. Mueller, *The Native Tongue and the Word: Developments in English Prose Style 1380–1580* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 133.

2. Background

The Middle English period is the most heterogeneous in the history of the written English language, with texts showing great linguistic diversity. However, from the fifteenth century onwards, while London English was becoming the dominant written, and to some extent spoken, variety, dialectal variations were decreasing. At the same time, a standard language variety, both written and spoken, gradually spread across the whole country. This was not an abrupt change, and linguistic differences continued to exist, though in a steadily decreasing number. This situation demands an analysis of linguistic phenomena which includes all their possible variants—in the case of this study, variants such as “*if she sey so hirself, than woll I beleve hit*” (‘if she herself says so, then I will believe it;’ CMMALORY) and “*and he wold aske mercy wyth a meke hert to God, God woll +geue hym mercy*” (‘if he asks for mercy from God with a gentle heart, God will give him mercy;’ CMMIRK, 91.2446).²

The heterogeneity of Middle and Early Modern English is certainly apparent in the case of subordinators. During the history of English, multiple uses of the same lexical item can be detected, a phenomenon which Kortmann terms “polyfunctionality.”³ In the case of conjunctions, the Middle English period sees the beginning of a remarkable overlap between coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, whereby coordinators can function as subordinators and vice versa. This paper investigates the former pattern, namely the process whereby *and*, one of the most common coordinating conjunctions, comes to introduce subordinate clauses, more specifically conditional clauses.

The origins of the subordinating function of *and* remain a controversial and highly debated issue; however, the supposition is still that the use of *and* as a subordinator is a Middle English phenomenon. The *Dictionary of Old English* implies that conditional *and* is a remnant of combinations existing already in Old English, such as *gelice and...*, meaning “like as if,” or *efen/ealswa...and*, “as/just as if.”⁴ *And* is thus

² The graphs +g, +t and +d are used in this corpus for the Middle English letters ȝ, þ and ð respectively.

³ Bernd Kortmann, *A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages* (Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997).

⁴ *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* online, ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey, et al. with web interface by Peter Mielke and Xin Xiang (Toronto: DOE project, 2007), <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>>, s.v. “and” conj., B.2.a.

attested as a conjunction introducing subordinate clauses, albeit only in combination with other words. As far as the first appearance of *and* functioning as a subordinator on its own is concerned, however, most commentators are in favour of dating its appearance to the early Middle English period—a position substantiated by my data.⁵ Previous research, however, has not moved much beyond these basic observations. Mueller offered some insights which have been little noticed, stating that clause-initial *and* could be substituted for *if* in spoken language in the late fourteenth century, and that this phenomenon reached its peak at the beginning of the seventeenth century. He saw *and* as an asymmetric conjunction,⁶ and defined the identifying features of *and* substituting for *if*: “(1) the finite verb of the clause headed by *an(d)* is in the subjunctive mood—e.g., ‘& thei had God,’ (2) there is no conjunctive particle heading the clause to which the *an(d)* clause stands in a conditional relation.” The clause lacking a conjunctive particle must, moreover, be adjoined directly at one or other end of the *an(d)* clause.⁷ This study came to my notice too late for these variables to be considered here, and thus the present work stands as a complement to rather than a development of Mueller’s. Fischer supports the dating of *and* to the early Middle English period, although she treats the subordinator *and* as a development from the coordinator *and*, and thus adds it to the rich list of subordinators in later Middle English.⁸ Mustanoja and Visser observe the use of conditional *an* in Middle English and, in Visser’s case, Early Modern English, with the variants *and* and *an if*, as well as *nif* in Early Modern English; however, they do not say anything about the frequency of these forms.⁹ Likewise, Kortmann gives a list of adverbial subordinators which includes *an(d)* *if* in Middle English and *an if* and *an(d)* in Early Modern English, but he neglects to specify when these forms were most or least frequently

⁵ James A. H. Murray, H. Bradley, W. A. Craigie, and C. T. Onions, eds., *The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume 1*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), s.v.; Francis Henry Stratmann, *A Middle English Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), s.v. 5; Bruce Mitchell, *Old English Syntax* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 2:\$3668.

⁶ Mueller, *The Native Tongue*, 134–35.

⁷ Mueller, *The Native Tongue*, 134.

⁸ Olga Fischer, “Syntax,” in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, ed. Norman Blake (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 2:348.

⁹ Tauno F. Mustanoja, *A Middle English Syntax*, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 23 (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 1960), 469; F. Th. Visser, *An Historical Syntax of the English Language* (Leiden: Brill, 1966), 2:\$880.

used.¹⁰ Rissanen remedies this to some extent, pointing out the possible decline and progressive disappearance of *an(d)* as a conditional subordinator in Early Modern English.¹¹ Likewise, Culpeper and Kytö think that the occurrence of *and*-conditionals first declined then disappeared in the Early Modern English period, suggesting that “other conjunctions might have been used instead of *and* for particular functions.”¹² However, it is worth noting that conditional *and* can still be found today, especially in Celtic Englishes.¹³ Furthermore, Curme also mentions the use of *and* or its variant *an* to mean “if” in American English “in our southern mountains and here and there in New England” in the earlier twentieth century.¹⁴ All the same, it is likely that in most dialects, the use of conditional *and* was more or less restricted to the Middle English and Early Modern English periods. Another, completely different, view is that the occurrence and the distribution of *and*-conditionals has causes other than the scribes’ dialects. Laing presumes the possible influence of different scribes during the copying procedure;¹⁵ scribes might have inconsistently converted, or even translated, texts into their own dialects, which might have lead to the occurrences of conditional *and* on which the present research is based.

An earlier origin for the conditional usage of *and* has been suggested. *And* has Germanic cognates, including the Middle High German word *unde* and the Old Norse *enda*, which were both used with a conditional sense.¹⁶ Based on this fact, the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED)

¹⁰ Kortmann, *A Typology and History*, 293.

¹¹ Matti Rissanen, “Syntax,” in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, ed. Roger Lass and Richard M. Hogg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 3:281.

¹² Jonathan Culpeper and Merja Kytö, “The Conjunction *and* in Early Modern English: Frequencies and Uses in Speech-Related Writing and Other Texts,” in *Generative Theory and Corpus Studies*, ed. Ricardo Bermúdez Otero et al. (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), 309.

¹³ See also Juhani Klemola and Markku Filppula, “Subordinating Uses of *and* in the History of English,” in *History of Englishes*, ed. Matti Rissanen et al. (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992), 310–318, and Markku Filppula, “The Grammar of the Irish Dialects of English,” in *The Celtic Englishes*, ed. Hildegard L. C. Tristram (Heidelberg: Winter, 1997), 225–245.

¹⁴ G. O. Curme, *A Grammar of the English Language in Three Volumes: Volume III. Syntax* (Boston: Heath, 1931), 318–323.

¹⁵ Margaret Laing, “Early Middle English—the East-West divide,” in *Placing Middle English in Context*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen et al. (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), 97–114.

¹⁶ *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “and” conj. formerly prep. IV.C; Georg Friedrich Benecke, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch, Dritter Band* (Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel,

suggests that the English usage of conditional *and* may have derived from that of the Old Norse *enda*, although it considers this suggestion very doubtful. More probably, the idiom arose in English independently, as apparently in Middle High German. Other scholars have sought to explain the possible origin(s) of some of the different usages of *and* as products of medieval language contact between English and Celtic languages. Klemola and Filppula argue that "subordinating *and*-structures closely equivalent to the ones met in Middle English and Early Modern English are a well attested feature of the neighbouring Celtic languages from their earliest stages on."¹⁷ As I have mentioned, the subordinating *and*-construction can be still found in those present-day varieties of English, such as Irish English and Scots, which have been in contact with Celtic languages more recently. That said, Kortmann admits that the phenomenon existed not only in the Celtic-speaking territories but in some other Western European languages: "a coordinating conjunction introducing an undoubtedly subordinate clause is a well-known phenomenon in Celtic languages and... was clearly not uncommon in earlier stages of other Western European languages."¹⁸ At any rate, whether conditional uses of cognates of *and* in other Germanic languages reflect Common Germanic usage or, more probably, innovations in parallel to English, they show that insular Celtic influence is not necessary to explain the development of conditional *and* in English.

The probable origins of conditional *and*, then, remain in doubt: further investigation on the subject is desirable, but this type of examination would exceed the scope of the present study. However, the detailed analysis of the primary data given here should help to provide a sound evidential basis for more general arguments about the rise of conditional *and* in English.

1861), s.v., §III.2; J. Fritzner, *Ordbog over det gamle norske sprog* (Chicago: Kristiania, Den Norske Forlagsforening, 1886–1896), s.v.

¹⁷ Klemola and Filppula, "Subordinating Uses," 315; see also Filppula, "The Grammar."

¹⁸ Kortmann, *A Typology and History*, 61.

3. Aims and methods

My specific aim in this paper is to examine the history of *and* in Middle English and Early Modern English—roughly corresponding to the period from 1150 to 1710—by analysing its occurrence in prose texts. I compare the rate of occurrence of conditional clauses introduced by *and* to the rate of occurrence of “regular” conditional clauses introduced by *if*. I tried to collect all possible spelling variants of both *if* and *and*, basing my list on the relevant entries in the *Middle English Dictionary*. In the case of *and*, the spellings *and*, *ant*, *an*, *a* and *&* were taken into consideration; in the case of *if*, the variants *if*, *ife*, *iffe*, *hif*, *3if(e)*, *3ive*, *3ihf*, *3ief*, *yif(f)e*, *gif(e)*, *giffe*, *gief*, *þif*, *þiif*, *ef*, *3ef(f)e*, *3eve*, *3eif*, *3hef*, *yef(f)e*, *yhef*, *gef*, *3uf*, *yf*, *gyf(f)e* and *zyf(f)e* were considered; hereafter, I refer to all these variants simply by their standard Present-day English reflexes *and* and *if*. I examine the *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English* (PPCME2) in section 4.1, and the *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English* (PPCEME) in section 4.2, while section 4.3 compares the data drawn from the two corpora. In both corpora, analyses of diatopic, diachronic and generic variation were also carried out wherever possible.

My analysis is predicated on the idea that the “prototypical conditional adjunct consists of a prepositional phrase with ‘if’ as head and a content clause as complement.”¹⁹ I also draw on the division of conditional clauses into four groups made by Akimova and Kozintseva in their recent study:²⁰

- Type 1.* complex sentences, as in “If you go, I’ll be there too;”
- Type 2.* compound sentences with the protasis expressed by imperative clauses, as in “Cut it carefully, you won’t be hurt;”
- Type 3.* semi-complex sentences with the protasis expressed using gerundial, participial, infinitive, or adjectival phrases, as in “The soup, if hot, is the best;”
- Type 4.* simple sentences with finite predicates and conditional adverbials introduced by the subordinating conjunctions *but* *for*,

¹⁹ Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey Pullum, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 732.

²⁰ Tatiana Akimova and Natalia Kozintseva, “Conditional Sentences in English,” in *LINCOM Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*, ed. Victor S. Xrakovskij (München: Lincom GmbH, 2005), 337.

in case, unless, provide, or on condition that, as in “But for Gordon we should have lost the match.”²¹

For greater precision, however, I sub-divide Type 1, and also add three additional categories to Akimova and Kozintseva’s four types. By dividing Type 1 into 1a and 1b, it becomes possible to distinguish between *If X, (then) Y* (1a), as in “If you go, I’ll be there too,” and *Y if X* (1b), as in “I’ll be there too if you go.” To express these in terms of the position of the conditional clause: 1a represents *sentence-initial* position, and 1b *sentence-final* position. In this analysis, Type 3 would be *sentence-medial* position. My further three types are as follows:

- Type 5. *if/and* occurs in a hypothetical exclamation or suggestion, as in “What if I went out for a walk?”
- Type 6. the combination *but if/and* occurs in the meaning “unless,” as in “He won’t say a word but if [= unless] he is asked to;”
- Type 7. clauses introduced by *as if/and*²² + past subjunctive which are hypothetical or unreal in meaning, such as “Jon behaves as if he were completely ignorant.”

As my aim is to examine the occurrence of *and* versus the more usual *if* as conditional subordinators—that is, in sentences where an overt subordinator introduces the conditional clause—I restrict my focus to types 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7. Hereafter, when speaking of conditional clauses, I am referring exclusively to those clauses that are introduced by an overt conditional subordinating conjunction.

The order of the protasis (the subordinate clause functioning as a complement of *if*) and the apodosis (the matrix clause minus the adjunct) is variable. The degree to which the order varies and whether the choice of subordinate conjunction (*and* or *if*) or text-type plays a role in this variation is a further topic which I analyse below.

²¹ Tatiana Akimova and Natalia Kozintseva, “Conditional Sentences in English,” in *LINCOM Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*, ed. Victor S. Xrakovskij (München: Lincom GmbH, 2005), 337, taken from *CGEL* §9.59.

²² The *Oxford English Dictionary* lists *as if* under “phrases” in the entry “introducing a clause of conditional or supposition.” *CGEL* categorises *as if* under “clauses of similarity and comparison,” (§15.50) while Huddleston and Pullum list it under “comparative constructions” (§5.5).

4. Analyses

4.1. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English*

The Middle English section of the diachronic part of the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* is the source of the text samples in the PPCME2. The *Penn Corpus* includes fifty-five samples of text which amount to almost 1.2 million words of running text. Table 1 shows the distribution of words within the corpus across both diatopic and diachronic categories. In accordance with the structure of the *Helsinki Corpus*, I list four subperiods (ME1, ME2, ME3 and ME4), and five dialects of Middle English (Kentish, Northern, Southern, East-Midlands, and West-Midlands).

4.1.1. *Diachronic and diatopic analysis*

All the texts were examined in order to determine the frequency of subordinating *and*-clauses, and the contrast between this and the frequency of *if*-clauses. Instances of subordinating *and* were identified on the basis of the meaning which seemed most probable in context on semantic and syntactic grounds. The PPCME2 contains 101 instances of *and* used in the sense of “if” in twenty-three texts (amounting to 3.51% of all the conditional *and/if* clauses in the corpus), as compared with 2,777 *if*-clauses (96.49%). The *and*-conditionals seem not to be very numerous overall, but more interesting patterns are revealed by an

Table 1. *Word counts by time and region in the PPCME2*

	ME1 (1150–1250)	ME2 (1250–1350)	ME3 (1350–1420)	ME4 (1420–1500)	Total
<i>Kentish</i>	4,316	51,914	–	–	56,230
<i>East-Midlands</i>	130,804	45,035	207,831	178,972	562,642
<i>West-Midlands</i>	116,802	–	81,092	162,152	360,046
<i>Northern</i>	–	–	18,470	11,070	29,540
<i>Southern</i>	–	–	104,179	43,834	148,013
Total	251,922	96,949	411,572	396,028	1,156,471

analysis according to diachronic and diatopic factors, and by a classification into the formal types and clause-orders discussed above.

The diachronic and diatopic variation in *and*- and *if*-conditionals is presented in table 2, below, which shows the proportion of conditional clauses represented by each subordinator type by region and sub-period. Not surprisingly, the clauses introduced by *if* are in the majority throughout the whole Middle English period. Subordinating *and*, however, first appears in the subperiod ME2, and becomes about three times as common in ME3, and about five times as common again in ME4.

The diachronic variation in the frequency of subordinating *and* can be refined by the application of diatopic criteria. Unfortunately, although the Kentish dialect affords our earliest attestation of subordinating *and* (in the phrase “*and* ye do+t +tet ure lord hoot, so ye ofserue+t +tane peni, +tet is eueriche blisce,” ‘if you do what our lord commands, you earn that penny which is heavenly bliss;’ CMKENTSE), Kentish is not represented in the corpus in the latter two periods, when most instances of subordinating *and* are found. The general diachronic patterns observed for subordinating *and* in Middle English as a whole are closely paralleled only in the Southern dialect. The frequencies in the other dialects vary more significantly; in the Northern dialect

Table 2. *Frequencies of and-conditionals by region and sub-period*

Period	ME1		ME2		ME3		ME4		Total by region	
Dialect	<i>if/and</i> ²²	% <i>and</i> ²³	<i>if/and</i>	% <i>and</i>	<i>if/and</i>	% <i>and</i>	<i>if/and</i>	% <i>and</i>	<i>if/and</i>	% <i>and</i>
<i>Kentish</i>	6/0	0%	109/1	0.91%	–	–	–	–	115/1	0.87%
<i>East Midlands</i>	394/0	0%	47/0	0%	736/12	1.60%	332/11	3.21%	1509/23	1.52%
<i>West Midlands</i>	291/0	0%	–	–	99/3	2.94%	137/64	31.84%	527/67	12.71%
<i>Southern</i>	–	–	–	–	204/4	1.92%	37/3	7.5%	241/7	2.90%
<i>Northern</i>	–	–	–	–	64/1	1.54%	321/2	0.62%	385/3	0.78%
Total by period	691/0	0%	156/1	0.64%	1103/20	1.78%	827/80	9.67%	2777/101	3.64%

²³ Conditional clauses introduced by either *if* or *and*.

²⁴ Percentage represented by *and*.

there is a considerable decrease from ME3 to ME4, while the other dialects show a rise in the last subperiod. It is hard to be sure how much significance to attach to these changes, given the small datasets involved. The picture emerging from the West Midlands is particularly striking: a large absolute number of conditional clauses in ME1 produced no examples of subordinating *and*; in ME2 there are no instances of conditional clauses at all; but there is a remarkable change from ME3 to ME4. However, this peak is accounted for largely by one text, Malory's *Morte Darthur* (CMMALORY), which was written in the West Midlands. Rather surprisingly, the majority of conditional clauses of types 1 and 3 there are introduced by *and* (the raw figures are fifty-six clauses introduced by *and* and forty introduced by *if*). That said, as I discuss below, a roughly similar proportion of *and*-conditionals to *if*-conditionals is attested by the *PPCEME* for the subsequent period, 1500–1569, and this figure is based on a rather larger and more diverse corpus. The overwhelming frequency of *and*-conditionals in the West Midland dialect would be consistent with the hypothesis, discussed above, that *and*-conditionals reflect Celtic influence, insofar as the West Midlands are the area of England closest to Wales. However, as I have also discussed, Celtic influence does not seem necessary to explaining the rise of *and*-conditionals. It would be interesting to see what kind of tendency would characterise the (sub)periods that follow ME4. Regrettably, however, the diatopic distribution of the manuscripts is not recorded in the *PPCEME*.

4.1.2. Formal type and clause order

It is also possible to analyse *if*- and *and*-conditionals according to their formal type and clause order, according to the classification introduced in section 3. Examples of each type derived from the corpus are:

Type 1a. And ye have nede, sende for us (CMMALORY)

[if you are in need, send for us]

Type 1b. The thridde shal be in heuen with blessed spirites and aungels, *if* we wel do (CMAELR4)

[The third will be in heaven with blessed spirits and angels, if we do well]

Type 3. Bot +tat fire, *if* it be *hate*, es swa delitabell and wondyrful +tat I ken nocht tell it (CMROLLEP)

[But that fire, if it is hot, is so delightful and wonderful that I cannot describe it]

Type 5. And *what* +*gif* +*te* bisshop +*tat* is but i-+geve to Goddes service do+*tnou*+*gt* his service nehis offys as he schulde (CMPOLYCH)

[And what if the bishop who is the servant of God does not perform either his service or his duty as he should?]

Type 6. but for +*tou* art pore, y may not, for schame, take +*te*, *but yf* +*tou* haue moche gold o+*ter* mony rentys (CMMIRK)

[but because you are poor, I may not, for shame, take you unless you have a lot of gold or a good income]

Type 7. +*Tan* +*tis* creatur fel down *as yf* she had lost hir bodyly strength (CMKEMPE)

[Then this creature fell down as if she had lost her physical strength]

Results for all the types of both *and*- (where possible) and *if*-conditionals are shown in table 3. Since conditional *and* turned out to occur only in types 1a and 1b, figures for types 3, 5, 6 and 7 are given only for *if*.

Since *and* appears only in types 1a and 1b, while *if*-conditionals appear in all types, we can conclude that *if* and *and* do not form a mutually

Table 3. *Types of conditionals—relative frequencies in percent*

	Type 1a (<i>and</i> -initial)		Type 1a (<i>if</i> -initial)		Type 1b (<i>and</i> -final)		Type 1b (<i>if</i> -final)		Type 3 (<i>if</i> -mid)		Type 5 (<i>what if</i> ...)		Type 6 (<i>but if</i> ...)		Type 7 (<i>as if</i> ...)	
	n ²⁴	% ²⁵	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
ME1	0	0	339	49.06	0	0	266	38.49	0	0	2	0.29	46	6.66	38	5.50
ME2	1	0.64	98	62.82	0	0	37	23.72	1	0.64	0	0	19	12.18	0	0
ME3	17	1.54	729	66.09	3	0.27	222	20.13	3	0.27	2	0.18	127	9.61	20	1.81
ME4	51	6.17	507	61.31	29	3.51	218	26.36	1	0.12	0	0	81	9.79	20	2.42
Total	69		1673		32		743		5		4		273		78	

²⁵ *n* stands for “absolute numbers.”

²⁶ Percentage of sub-period’s *and/if* conditionals.

exclusive pair: *and* does not exclusively occur in the positions where *if* does not. What is less certain is whether *and* and *if* were in free variation: whether *and* could occur wherever *if* could. Type 1 accounts for 87.03% of all *if*-conditionals, and, given the small finite numbers of *and*-conditionals overall, it may be that the absence of *and* from other types simply represents a gap in the data. On the other hand, it could be that sentences of, for example, the type **y may not take +te, but and +tou haue moche gold*²⁷ were not in use. However, the idea that conditional *and* was restricted to Type 1 is suggested by the data for ME3 and ME4: in this period, we have enough data to say that, if conditional *and* had been as frequent in Types 3, 5, 6 and 7 as it was in Type 1, *and*-conditionals of these types would have appeared. That is to say, in ME4, 9.94% of Type 1 conditionals were *and*-conditionals. Since we have 102 attestations of other types of conditionals, we would expect about ten of these to be *and*-conditionals if *and*-conditionals had occurred in those positions as frequently as they did in the Type 1 position, but instead we simply find 102 *if*-conditionals. This pattern is consistent with the early modern data considered below, in section 4.2. At any rate, the distributions of *and* and *if* across Types 1a, 1b and 3 seem to be closely matched. If we ignore those *if*-conditionals that fall under types other than 1a (initial), 1b (final) and 3 (mid), 69.1% of *if*-conditionals are Type 1a, 30.69% are 1b, and 0.21% are 3. This closely matches the pattern for *and*-conditionals: 68.32% are Type 1a, 31.68% are Type 1b, and 0% (an absence which certainly need not be significant in view of the limited data) are Type 3.

It is worth noting another phenomenon, the use of the collocation *and if*. This is what the *OED* calls a *strengthened conjunction*, with the same meaning as either of the subordinators on its own. In the Middle English data, these *strengthened conjunctions* occur only in CMREYNAR in ME4, one example being

But *and yf* he wolde haue comen hyther he myght haue ben here
(CMREYNAR)

[but if he had come here, he might have been here].

Despite the low number of occurrences, this type of strengthening effect should not be overlooked, since it continues to occur in later periods

²⁷ Sentence constructed on the basis of the existing *if*-clause quoted above as an example of Type 6.

as well (see example twelve in 4.2 below). It can also be concluded that an analysis of texts based exclusively on the types discussed by Akimova and Kozintseva seems to be inadequate; a survey of the *OED* was necessary in order to create a comprehensive list of all the possible variants of the conditional clauses under discussion.

4.2. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English*

The *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English* is divided into three sections and three subperiods (in accordance with the *Helsinki Corpus*), and consists of almost 1.8 million words altogether; the distribution of these words is shown in Table 4. All three sections include manuscripts from all the subperiods (E1–E3). Penn 1 and Penn 2 are supplements to the Helsinki section; Penn 1 mainly contains text samples by the same authors as those in the Helsinki section. Penn 2 contains more new material than Penn 1.

Almost four times as many texts are available in the *PPCEME* as in the corpus from which my Middle English data are drawn, the *PPCME2*; the corpus totals 192 texts.

The *PPCEME* contains one hundred instances of *and* used in the sense of “if” throughout the whole Early Modern English period, which is 2.2% of all the conditional clauses that are introduced by an overt subordinator during this period. This suggests a decline in the number of occurrences from Middle English to Early Modern English, since in Middle English the total frequency of *and*-conditionals as a proportion of all conditionals introduced by an overt subordinator was 3.51%. However, from ME4 to E1, we see a rise from 8.82% to 9.86%; only after this, according to the data, does the decline begin.

Table 4. *Word counts in PPCEME*

	Helsinki	Penn 1	Penn 2	Total
E1 (1500–1569)	196,754	194,018	185,423	576,195
E2 (1570–1639)	196,742	223,064	232,993	652,799
E3 (1640–1710)	179,477	197,908	187,631	565,016
Total	572,973	614,990	606,047	1,794,010

Table 5. *Relative and absolute frequencies of if- and and-clauses*

	<i>and</i> - conditional	% of <i>and</i> - conditionals	<i>if</i> - conditional	% of <i>if</i> - conditionals	<i>Total</i>
E1	86	9.86%	759	90.14%	842
E2	13	0.67%	1935	99.33%	1948
E3	1	0.06%	1750	99.94%	1751
Total	100	2.2%	4444	97.8%	4544

The changing balance of the different Early Modern English conditional clauses presents a mirror image of that in Middle English: after the swift rise in *and*-clauses from ME2 to the peak in ME4–E1, there is a rapid decline from E1 to E3. The question of how far subordinating *and* continues to exist can be answered only through an analysis of additional corpora drawn from subsequent period(s)—as I have mentioned above, the persistence of subordinating *and* into Present-Day English is attested in certain dialects. As mentioned above, diatopic analysis of the distribution of variants from the Early Modern English period onwards is unfortunately not possible, since only those texts which represent standard written English were entered into the corpus. However, as with the Middle English material, it is possible to assess the range of formal types of *and*- and *if*- conditionals, using the categorisation given in section three and modified in section 4.1. As in 4.1, the clause order in conditional sentences does not play a vital role, and, since the occurrence of Types 1a and b is even more balanced in the Early Modern English period, I have merged these back to an undifferentiated Type 1 (as suggested by Akimova and Kozintseva and discussed in section three, above). Type 3, on the other hand, is unattested in the corpus, and so it does not appear in the following categorisation. Consequently, only four types are attested in conditional sentences in the Early Modern English period: Types 1, 5, 6 and 7 (shown by Table 6 below). These can be exemplified from the corpora thus:

Type 1. God, *and* yt be hys blyssyd wylle, make me one of your sorte (MOWNTAYNE)

Type 5. *what and* she come not (UDALL)

Type 6. nothing in her body you wold haue changed, *but if* you would haue wished her somewhat higher (MORERIC)

Type 7. Dost thou not know that all Herbs and Trees, *as if* their Mouths were fastned downward in the Earth, do draw up their Nourishment by the Root (BOETHPR)

Table 6. *Types of conditionals—relative frequencies in percent*

	Type 1 (<i>and-initial and final</i>)		Type 1 (<i>if-initial and final</i>)		Type 5 (<i>what and...</i>)		Type 5 (<i>what if...</i>)		Type 6 (<i>but if...</i>)		Type 7 (<i>as if...</i>)	
	n ²⁷	% ²⁸	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
E1	81	1.41	740	12.84	5	0.09	6	0.104	11	0.19	2	0.035
E2	13	0.199	1824	27.94	0	0	10	0.15	0	0	101	1.55
E3	1	0.017	1649	29.19	0	0	11	0.19	1	0.017	89	1.58
Total	95	1.65	4213	73.12	5	0.09	27	0.47	12	0.21	192	3.33

The strengthened conditional conjunction (*and if*), discussed in the previous section, is present in *PPCEME* as well, as in

for so they get more *and if* they went together (HARMAN).

This cannot, then, be treated as an exclusively Middle English phenomenon, although its frequency is rather insignificant in both periods. It would be interesting, however, to see whether this strengthened conjunction continues to be used in the Modern English period as well, or whether it dies out completely. As mentioned above, diatopic analysis of the distribution of variants is not possible from the Early Modern English period onwards, since only those texts which represent standard written English were included in the corpus.

5. Conclusion

This article examined the use of the conjunction *and* as a conditional subordinator, from its first appearance until its disappearance from the data studied. Both the Middle English and the Early Modern English period afforded enough text samples not only to trace the history of

²⁸ Absolute numbers.

²⁹ Percentage of sub-period's conditionals.

Table 7. *Ratio of if- to and-conditionals from ME1 to E3*

	ME1 (1150–1250)	ME2 (1250–1350)	ME3 (1350–1420)	ME4 (1420–1500)	E1 (1500–1569)	E2 (1570–1639)	E3 (1640–1710)
<i>And</i>	0%	0.64%	1.78%	8.82%	9.86%	0.67%	0.06%
<i>If</i>	100%	99.36%	98.22%	91.18%	90.14%	99.33%	99.94%

conditional *and*, but also to compare it to the unmarked conditional subordinator *if*.

Table 7 offers a comparative view of the relative frequencies of the two types of conditional clause from the first subperiod of Middle English until the end of the Early Modern English period, and clearly shows the rise and fall in the frequency of *and*-conditionals. The use of conditional *and* is not characteristic of a single subperiod, region or genre, however. Of course, there are categories where its use is more significant than in others, most strikingly the West Midlands in ME4, which shows the highest frequency of conditional *and*, mainly due to Malory's *Morte D'arthur*. This single text provides the majority of the conditional clauses introduced by *and* in ME4 (if we consider only Types 1 and 3). The fact that a significant proportion of the occurrences of conditional *and* were found in the West Midlands is not inconsistent with the Celtic hypothesis presented by Klemola and Filppula and Filppula, as mentioned in section two above, but cannot necessarily be taken as evidence in support of the hypothesis.³⁰

A sudden decline followed the peak in the use of conditional *and* in ME4; as *if* started to become the normal conditional subordinator, it displaced *and* from its conditional function, thus limiting it to its original function of coordinating conjunction. This suggestion correlates well with the ideas of Culpeper and Kytö, mentioned in 2.3, above.³¹ With the standardisation of the language, coordinating conjunctions and subordinators became more invariant; consequently, *and* occurred more in its original role as a coordinating conjunction and less (or even not at all) as a subordinator.

³⁰ Klemola and Filppula, "Subordinating Uses of *and*," Filppula, "The Grammar of the Irish Dialects."

³¹ "The Conjunction *and*."

Works Cited

Middle English texts

- CMAELR4: Ælred of Rievaulx. 1984. *De Institutione Inclusarum*. Ed. J. Ayto and A. Barratt, Early English Text Society O.S. 287. London: Oxford University Press. 32.270–39.532 (MS VERNON, i.e., MS BODLEY Eng. Poet. A.1., S. C. 3938–42).
- CMKEMPE: Kempe, Margery. 1940. *The Book of Margery Kempe, Vol I*. Ed. S. B. Meech and H. E. Allen, Early English Text Society O.S. 212. London: Oxford University Press.
- CMKENTSE: Hall, J. 1963 (1920). *Kentish Sermons: Selections From Early Middle English 1130–1250, Part I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- CMMALORY: Malory, Thomas. 1954. *Morte Darthur: The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*. Ed. E. Vinaver. London: Oxford University Press.
- CMMIRK: Mirk, John. 1905. *Mirk's Festival: A Collection of Homilies, by Johannes Mirkus (John Mirk), Part I*. Ed. T. Erbe, Early English Text Society E.S. 96. London: Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
- CMPOLYCH: Trevisa, John. 1879, 1882. *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, Monachi Cestrensis, Vols. VI, VIII: English Translations of John Trevisa and of an Unknown Writer of the Fifteenth Century*. Ed. J. R. Lumby, Rolls Series, 41. London: [publisher unknown].
- CMREYNAR: Caxton, William. 1970. *The History of Reynard the Fox. Translated from the Dutch original by William Caxton*. Ed. N. F. Blake, Early English Text Society O.S. 263. London: Oxford University Press.
- CMROLLEP: Richard Rolle. 1931. *Epistles (Ego Dormio, The Commandment, The Form of Living): English Writings of Richard Rolle, Hermit of Hampole*. Ed. Hope E. Allen. Oxford: Clarendon.

Early Modern English texts

- BOETHPHR: Preston, Richard. 1695. *Anicius Manlius Severinus Boetius, Of the Consolation of Philosophy in Five Books. Made English and Illustrated with Notes, by the Right Honourable Richard Lord Viscount Preston*. Early English Books 1641–1700, 126: 6. London: Printed by J.D. for Awnsham and John Churchill, at the Black Swan in Pater-Noster Row; and Francis Hildyard Bookseller in York.
- HARMAN: Harman, Thomas. 1869. *A Caueat or Warening for Commen Cursetors Vulgarely Called Vagabones, by Thomas Harman Esquiere*. Ed. Edward Viles and F.J. Furnivall, Early English Text Society E.S. 9. London: Trübner.
- MORERIC: More, Thomas. 1963. *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More, Volume 2*. Ed. Richard Standish Sylvester. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- MOWNTAYNE: Mowntayne, Thomas. 1859. *The Autobiography of Thomas Mowntayne. Narratives of the Days of the Reformation, Chiefly from the Manuscripts of John Foxe the Martyrologist; with Two Contemporary Biographies of Archbishop Cranmer*. Ed. John Gough Nichols, Camden Society 77. London: [no publisher]. Reprinted New York: AMS Press.
- UDALL: Udall, Nicholas. 1934 (for 1935). *Roister Doister*. Malone Society reprints. London: Oxford University Press.

Secondary sources

- Akimova, Tatiana and Natalia Kozintseva. 2005. Conditional Sentences in English. In *LINCOM Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*, ed. Victor S. Xrakovskij, 336–357. München: Lincom GmbH.
- Benecke, Georg Friedrich. 1861. *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch, Dritter Band*. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel.

- Bosworth, J. and T. N. Toller. 1955. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, Angus, Ashley Crandell AmCameron, Angus, Ashley GrandeCameron, Angus, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey *et al.*, eds. 2007. *Dictionary of Old English: A to G* online. Toronto: DOE project. <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>>.
- Culpeper, J. and M. Kytö. 2000. The Conjunction *and* in Early Modern English: Frequencies and Uses in Speech-Related Writing and Other Texts. In *Generative Theory and Corpus Studies*, ed. Ricardo Bermúdez Otero *et al.*, 299–326. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Curme, G. O. 1931. *A Grammar of the English Language in Three Volumes: Volume III. Syntax*. Boston: Heath.
- Filppula, Markku. 1997. The Grammar of the Irish Dialects of English. In *The Celtic Englishes*, ed. Hildegard L. C. Tristram, 225–245. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Fischer, Olga. 1992. Syntax. In *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume 2*, ed. Norman Blake, 207–409. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fritzner, J. 1886–1896. *Ordbog over det gamle norske sprog*. Chicago: Kristiania, Den Norske Forlagsforening.
- The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*. 1991. Compiled by Matti Rissanen, Merja Kytö; Leena Kahlas-Tarkka, Matti Kilpiö; Saara Nevanlinna, Irma Taavitsainen; Terttu Nevalainen, Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. Helsinki: Department of English, University of Helsinki.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klemola, J. and M. Filppula. 1992. Subordinating Uses of *and* in the History of English. In *History of Englishes*, ed. Matti Rissanen *et al.*, 310–318. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kortmann, Bernd. 1997. *A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kurath, Hans and Sherman M. Kuhn. 1956–2002. *The Middle English Dictionary*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Laing, Margaret. 2000. Early Middle English—the East-West divide. In *Placing Middle English in Context*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen *et al.*, 97–114. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English Syntax, Volume 2*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mueller, Janel M. 1984. *The Native Tongue and the Word: Developments in English Prose Style 1380–1580*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Murray, James A. H., H. Bradley, W. A. Craigie, and C. T. Onions, eds. 1961. *The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume 1*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mustanoja, Tauno F. 1960. *A Middle English Syntax*. Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 23. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, Second Edition (PPCME2)*. 2000. Compiled by Anthony Kroch, and Ann Taylor. Further information: <<http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/PPCME2-RELEASE-2/index.htm>>.
- The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (PPCEME)*. 2004. Compiled by Kroch, Anthony, Beatrice Santorini, and Lauren Delfs. Further information: <<http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/PPCEME-RELEASE-1/index.htm>>.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sydney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Rissanen, Matti. 1999. Syntax. In *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume 3*, ed. Roger Lass and Richard M. Hogg, 187–331. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stratmann, Francis Henry. 1994. *A Middle English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Visser, F. Th. 1966. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language, Volume 2*. Leiden: Brill.

TRANSLATING CHAUCER'S POWER PLAY INTO MODERN ENGLISH AND FINNISH

Mari Pakkala-Weckström
University of Helsinki

1. *Introduction*

In a series of earlier studies, I investigated the use of power as reflected in politeness features in the male/female dialogue of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*.¹ I found that shifts in the locus of intimate power were often indicated by subtle linguistic devices, such as the introduction of terms of endearment or the dropping of respectful address forms. My intention in this paper is to look at four different translations of the *Canterbury Tales*—three of them translations into modern English and one into Finnish—to see whether and how such devices have been preserved.² Although the post-medieval reception of the *Canterbury Tales* has attracted significant amounts of research, the history of their translation into English has yet to receive extensive study. I concentrate on three fabliaux: the *Miller's Tale*, the *Merchant's Tale* and the *Shipman's Tale*. These all provide excellent examples of power shifts in the dialogue between male and female characters.³ I argue that these indicators of power play have often gone unnoticed by the translators.

Translating from Middle English into modern English is not exactly the same as translating from a foreign language: the source language

¹ Mari Pakkala-Weckström, *The Dialogue of Love, Marriage and 'Maistrise' in Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales'*, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique 67 (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 2005).

² I would like to thank Professor Terttu Nevalainen for suggesting—after listening to my complaints about the difficulty of finding suitable translations of Chaucer's often delicate devices for indicating power shifts—that I write an article on the subject.

³ Though there are many excellent definitions for the genre of fabliau, the characterisation of Chaucer's fabliaux by Derek Pearsall ("The Canterbury Tales II: Comedy," in *The Cambridge Chaucer Companion*, ed. Piero Boitani and Jill Mann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 125–142, at 128) might be the most suitable for my purposes: "tales...in which a bourgeois husband is duped or tricked into conniving at the free award of his wife's sexual favours to a clever young man."

and target language are closely related in terms of both grammar and vocabulary, yet they differ from each other enough to justify the translation process. I examine examples from the dialogue in the three tales as translated into modern English by J. U. Nicholson (1934), Frank Ernest Hill (1935), and Nevill Coghill (1951), and into Finnish by Toivo Lyy (1975).⁴ The examples will be analysed using the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson and Culpeper's impoliteness output strategies.⁵ In addition, some translation strategies will be examined in the light of Antoine Berman's concept of deforming tendencies: according to Berman, literary translations "are concerned with *works*, that is to say texts so bound to their language that the translating act inevitably becomes a manipulation of signifiers, where two languages enter into various forms of collision and somehow *couple*."⁶

I feel this is a most appropriate tribute to Dr. Kilpiö, since he has been both my inspiring translation teacher and a colleague with whom I have shared texts and ideas about translation as well as about the history and development of the English language.

2. Chaucer into modern English—translation or modernisation?

The translation of a text from an earlier version of a language into a later version of the same language is a relatively rare phenomenon. Jakobson distinguishes between *intralingual*, *interlingual*, and *intersemiotic* translation, intralingual translation being defined as "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language."⁷ Jakobson's definition, however, does not really take into account the

⁴ Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Canterbury Tales*, trans. J. U. Nicholson (Garden City, New York: Garden City Publishing Company, 1934); *The Canterbury Tales*, trans. Frank Ernest Hill (New York: David McKay Company, 1935); *The Canterbury Tales*, trans. Nevill Coghill (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1951); *Canterburyn tarinoita*, trans. Toivo Lyy (Porvoo: WSOY, 1975).

⁵ Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Jonathan Culpeper, "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness," *Journal of Pragmatics* 25 (1996): 349–367.

⁶ Antoine Berman, "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign," trans. Lawrence Venuti, in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2004), 276–289, at 277; see also Jerome Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (London: Routledge, 2001), 150–151.

⁷ Roman Jakobson, "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation," in *On Translation*, ed. R. A. Brower (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 232–239, at 233.

idea of a historical continuum or that the language may have changed enough to make translation necessary for understanding.⁸ Therefore, it might be helpful to think of the process of this kind of intralingual translation as comparable to *retranslation*, that is, the production of new versions of texts that have already been translated into the target language. This process occurs with texts such as the Bible and other religious texts, or translations of Shakespeare's works into Finnish.

Irmeli Helin, who has studied the phenomenon of retranslating, specialising in the retranslation of hymns, lists five main reasons for retranslation:⁹

- (1) Changing language
- (2) Changing society
- (3) Changing ideologies
- (4) Changing culture
- (5) Changing interaction between languages and cultures.

The first reason would seem to be the most important motive for translating Chaucer into modern English: the language has undergone fundamental changes, which may make the original text hard for a modern reader to comprehend. All three modern English translations examined here strive to be quite faithful to the original. All three translators explain the motives and the principles that have guided them in introductory chapters, and these explanations will be briefly examined here.

U. J. Nicholson, whose 1934 version is the earliest used in this study, offers his readers an *apologia*: "it may be called in question whether such a work, performed by anyone, is justifiable."¹⁰ He continues by expressing a wish that reading the translation—which he compares to "diluted wine"—might kindle an interest in the readers to turn to

⁸ Outi Paloposki notes that language borders are always fuzzy, and that languages form both geographical as well as historical continuums: "Kääntäminen historiassa," in *Alussa oli käännös*, ed. Riitta Oittinen and Pirjo Mäkinen (Tampere: Tampere University Press, 2004), 349–373, at 351.

⁹ "Kääntäjä ja yhteiskunta—uudelleenääntämisen yhteiskunnallinen viitekehys," in *Kielen matkassa multimediaan. Näkökulmia kääntämisen tutkimiseen ja opiskelemiseen*, ed. Hilkka Yli-Jokipii, University of Helsinki Publications of the Department of Translation Studies 1 (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 2005), 145–164.

¹⁰ Nicholson, *The Canterbury Tales*, xi.

the original, the “unadulterated vintage.”¹¹ Hill, the translator of the 1935 version, in his more matter-of-fact introduction to the translation, points out that English vocabulary has changed considerably since Chaucer’s time: words may have changed their meaning or disappeared altogether.¹² He also notes that the similarity of the two versions of the same language “often involving differences, makes for difficulty.” However, in a similar vein to Nicholson’s *apologia*, Hill also hopes that his translation might encourage the reader to turn to the original Middle English poem.¹³ Meanwhile, Nevill Coghill, whose translation of the *Canterbury Tales* was first published in 1951, notes in his introduction that

...when it comes to translation from an earlier kind of English into a modern kind it can be argued that it is wrong, even morally wrong, for it is not only doomed to some measure of inaccuracy but is also a pandering to laziness; any Englishman who is willing to take the trouble can read Chaucer for himself in the original.¹⁴

Coghill pleads that, in attempting to render Chaucer into contemporary speech, he is in good company; for example, Dryden, Pope, and Wordsworth have all undertaken similar tasks in the past.¹⁵ Coghill also explains his translation process in more depth than Nicholson and Hill:

I have therefore treated [Chaucer’s] poem as any true translator would treat a classic in a foreign tongue, that is with fidelity not to the form of a word but to idiom and the wealth of meaning in a word, and also the tone of voice or manner in which the meaning is conveyed. My first hope is that the result may be considered as a poem and not as a crib.¹⁶

All these introductory notes by the translators imply that the task of translating Middle English into modern English requires a lot of justification and even apology. Only Coghill actually dares to compare his efforts with translation from another language. He also provides a list of four main translation strategies, which include following the metre,

¹¹ Nicholson, *The Canterbury Tales*, xii.

¹² Hill, *The Canterbury Tales*, x.

¹³ Hill, *The Canterbury Tales*, xiii.

¹⁴ Coghill, *The Canterbury Tales*, 16.

¹⁵ Coghill, *The Canterbury Tales*, 16–17.

¹⁶ Coghill, *The Canterbury Tales*, 17.

rhyme scheme, meaning and tone of voice of the original, but avoiding rhymes that would no longer sound acceptable in English.¹⁷

3. *Translation proper? The Finnish version*

Two of the three English translations contain the entire *Canterbury Tales*; Coghill's is the exception, in that for reasons of space he has left out the two prose tales, the *Tale of Melibee* and the *Parson's Tale*; only brief summaries are provided of these. In contrast, the Finnish translation is actually a selection of the *Tales*. The three unfinished tales have been left out altogether, but so have seven other tales, because the translator believes that the modern reader would hardly be interested in them.¹⁸ A brief synopsis of each tale is given, and the motives behind the selection process are further explained.¹⁹ The *Prioress's Tale* has been omitted because of its anti-Semitic subject matter; the *Clerk's Tale* because of its anti-feminist subject matter; the *Franklin's Tale* possibly for the same reason. These would seem to be cultural or even ideological motives. Similarly a cultural decision seems to have been made in excluding the *Second Nun's Tale*, the *Monk's Tale*, and the two prose tales; these have not been translated simply because the translator did not think that his audience would find them interesting.

The Finnish translator's task must have been a lot less intimidating than that of his English colleagues; translating into a completely different language is, of course, an example of what we might call 'translation proper,' and therefore no particular apologies are needed. In addition, the source and target languages have very little in common, which obviously gives the translator much more leeway or poetic licence in his work; this will become clear when examining the examples below.

4. *Power and politeness in intimate dialogue*

Power in human relationships is an elusive concept, but it is still possible to make a basic division into institutional power and private power.

¹⁷ Coghill, *The Canterbury Tales*, 17–18.

¹⁸ Lyy, *Canterburyn tarinoita*, xx.

¹⁹ Lyy, *Canterburyn tarinoita*, xx–xxviii.

The former is power given to a person by their age, social status, profession, or gender and so forth. This kind of power affects interaction between individuals mainly in institutional settings, but it can be carried over to more private contexts as well. Asymmetry in institutional power is relatively stable. In contrast, private power is more dynamic, and constantly negotiated in interaction between individuals.²⁰

One way of measuring the degree and locus of power between individuals is by looking at the use of politeness strategies in interaction. Here, as in my previous work, the framework I use to study these is the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson.²¹ This theory is based on the central concept of face, which is the image that every person has of themselves. Brown and Levinson distinguish between two aspects of a person's face: a positive face and a negative face.

A person's positive face reflects their need to be accepted and liked by others; in contrast, their negative face reflects their need to be independent operators. Both sides of one's face are vulnerable, and therefore, according to Brown and Levinson, they need to be constantly redressed in all interaction. This can be done by using redressive politeness strategies, which are also categorised into negative and positive, according to which aspect of one's face they redress. Negative politeness is roughly comparable to what is traditionally considered polite behaviour—it includes apologies, respectful forms of address and hedging. Positive politeness, in turn, is roughly equivalent to friendly behaviour; it consists of in-group strategies, such as including the addressee in the action by using "we" instead of "you," or the use of nicknames, endearments, etc.

The need to redress an interlocutor's face in interaction is an indication of having less power than the interlocutor. Thus, when there is an asymmetry of institutional power between the participants in interaction, the use of politeness strategies reflects this: a patient will usually be polite to their doctor, and a defendant in a courtroom will address the judge deferentially. Between interactants of roughly equal institutional power, however, the introduction of politeness strategies, both positive and negative, can signify a shift in the locus of intimate power. For instance, a wife who is afraid of losing her husband's love or respect may try to improve his attitude using increased attention

²⁰ Richard J. Watts, *Power in Family Discourse*, Contributions to the Sociology of Language 63 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991), 3.

²¹ See note 5.

and endearments; similarly, a lover trying to impress his lady may become particularly respectful.

The idea that all incidents which would be classified by Brown and Levinson as positive or negative politeness strategies being used to redress face are indeed meant as strategic—that is, intentional—behaviour has been widely criticised.²² However, when analysing fictional dialogue, it is reasonable to assume that poets developing fictional characters might (consciously or unconsciously) envisage strategic behaviour in their characters and expect their audiences to pick up on characters' politeness strategies.

The polar opposite of politeness is impoliteness. Even though the Brown and Levinson framework recognises insults as examples of Face-Threatening Acts, it does not really consider the possibility of intentional face-attacking behaviour. Jonathan Culpeper notes that "an inherently impolite act does not involve *virtual* or *potential* offence; it is in its very performance offensive and thus not amenable to politeness work."²³

In fictional male/female dialogue between married couples or lovers, the shifts in the balance of power can manifest themselves in phenomena such as a sudden increase in endearments, respectful address forms, hedges, or apologies. The introduction of impolite behaviour is also a clear sign of changing power relations between interactants.

5. *Power play in the three fabliaux*

Chaucer's fabliaux are typical representatives of the genre, in that they all involve adultery and the double-crossing of somewhat slow-witted husbands by their cunning spouses.²⁴ Therefore, quite a lot of

²² See, e.g., Gino Eelen, *Critique of Politeness Theories* (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2001); Andreas H. Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen, "Introduction," in *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems, Pragmatics & Beyond* New Series 107 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003), 1–25; Sara Mills, *Gender and Politeness*, Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 17 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Richard J. Watts, *Politeness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003). Brown and Levinson, *Politeness*, 85 do actually note that "We do not mean to imply that what we dub 'strategies' are necessarily conscious...but the general unconscious nature of such strategies raises methodological problems that we simply skirt."

²³ "Towards an Anatomy," 351.

²⁴ There are four fabliaux in the *Canterbury Tales*: the *Miller's Tale*, the *Reeve's Tale*, the *Merchant's Tale* and the *Shipman's Tale*. The *Reeve's Tale*, although containing scenes of adultery, has its main focus elsewhere, and thus includes very little dialogue between husbands and wives; it is therefore not included in this study.

redressive action is warranted to keep the cuckolded husband happy and ignorant. In the *Miller's Tale* and the *Merchant's Tale*, the usually reserved wives suddenly transform into loving spouses when they are planning to commit adultery; in the *Shipman's Tale*, the adultery has already taken place, and the wife is about to be exposed when she turns on her charm. Impoliteness strategies can also sometimes be found in the dialogue, although they tend to occur in scenes of open confrontation, which are relatively rare in male/female dialogue.²⁵

Below, I shall provide examples of these power strategies from the three tales. The examples are structured as follows: the original Middle English line is assigned a number (x); the 1934 translation by Nicholson is listed as (xb); the 1935 translation by Hill as (xc); the 1951 translation by Coghill as (xd); and the Finnish translation by Lyy as (xe). For the convenience of readers who do not know Finnish, I provide literal, line-by-line translations of the Finnish examples into English.²⁶

5.1 *Positive and negative politeness strategies in the tales*

In the *Miller's Tale*, the young wife assists her admirer by feeding her husband a tale which will distract him and give the couple a chance for love-making. This is achieved through the use of endearments and an emphasis on their marital bond:²⁷

(1) I am thy trewe, verray wedded wyf;
Go, deere spouse, and help to save oure lyf. (I (A) 3609–3610)

(1b) I am your true and lawfully wedded wife;
Go, my dear spouse, and help to save our life.

(1c) I am thy true and loyal wedded wife;
Go, husband, go and help to save my life.

²⁵ This does not mean that there would not be confrontation scenes in the *Canterbury Tales*; see, e.g., Andreas Jucker, "Slanders, Slurs and Insults on the Road to Canterbury: Forms of Verbal Aggression in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*," in *Placing Middle English in Context*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Päivi Pahta and Matti Rissanen, Topics in English Linguistics 35 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), 369–389.

²⁶ Translations of inset quotations provided by Bethany Fox.

²⁷ The strategic nature of Alison's endearments becomes obvious when compared to the only other exchange in which she addresses her husband, in which she addresses him in a matter-of-fact way by his first name: "God woot, John" (I(A) 3369).

- (1d) I am your honest, true and wedded wife,
Go, dearest husband, help to save my life!
- (1e) Voi!—mene!—juokse pelastamaan meitä
ettemme silleen henkeämme heitä!
Et omaa, uskollista vaimoas
saa jättää surman suuhun, avuttas,
suloinen sulhoni ja puolisoni!
- [Oh!—go!—run to save us
so that we will not perish in this way
Your own faithful wife
you cannot leave in the jaws of death, without your help,
my sweet groom and spouse!]

Here the Finnish translation differs most from the source text, taking a measure of poetic licence: the word-order has been changed, and the expression “help to save oure lyf” has been *expanded*, which is to say that it is extended in a way that doesn’t really add anything, but “augments only the gross mass of text”²⁸ into something literally translatable as “go, save us,/ so that we won’t perish in that manner”. This kind of excitation is, according to Berman, “a stretching, a slackening, which impairs the rhythmic flow of the work.”²⁹ The endearment “deere spouse” has been expanded, too, becoming “suloinen sulhoni ja puolisoni” (‘my sweet groom and spouse’). Obviously, adding the alliteration and assonance in *suloinen sulhoni* gives a poetic touch to the line, and has thus proved an irresistible temptation to the translator; however, in terms of Berman’s deformation tendencies, this is a clear case of *ennoblement*: “a rewriting, a ‘stylistic exercise’ based on—and at the expense of—the original.”³⁰

The English translations are more faithful to the original. All three preserve the “trew, verray wedded wyf,” even though the adjective “lawfully” in version (1b) sounds a little too technical, particularly for someone like the miller’s wife.³¹ The “deere spouse” has been translated closely in versions (1b) and (1d); version (1c), however, leaves

²⁸ Berman, “Translation,” 282.

²⁹ “Translation,” 282.

³⁰ “Translation,” 282–283.

³¹ S. S. Hussey, *Chaucer: An Introduction* (London: Methuen and Co., 1971), 145, for example, notes that Alison’s description suggests “on the one hand...the wholesome country girl of eighteen,...on the other...her restiveness and her willingness to find solace elsewhere.”

out the adjective, and therefore appears to change Alison's plea into an order.

This pattern, in which the wife stresses her love and fidelity, is repeated in all three fabliaux. In the *Merchant's Tale* the assurance also takes place as the wife prepares to meet her lover. In terms of politeness, this can be considered an example of *gift-giving*: this strategy aims to satisfy the addressee's need to be liked.³² In May's sentimental speech to January, the ideas of the flower of wifhood that she has put in his hand and the binding of her body to his are tokens of gift-giving, and she has clearly chosen her expressions to suit his strong physical needs.³³

(2) And of my wyfhod thilke tendre flour,
Which that I have assured in youre hond
Whan that the preest to yow my body bond (IV (E) 2190–2192)

(2b) And of my wifhood that sweet flower divine
Which I assured you of, both safe and sound,
When unto you that priest my body bound

(2c) And tender flower of wifhood, fresh and new,
Set in your hands, my lord, as justly due you
With the priest's words that bound my body to you.

(2d) Which for a wife is like a flower upon her.
I put it in your hands for good or ill
When the priest bound my body to your will

(2e) naissuvun sitä sulosinta kukkaa
ja kalleutta, jonka silloin kannoin
käteesi ja sen vaalittavaks annoin,
kun pappi satoi minut ruumiineni
sinuun ja vihki sinut miehekseni.
[this sweetest flower of womanhood
and the preciousness which then I carried
to your hands and gave it to you to cherish
when the priest bound me and my body
to you and hallowed you to be my husband.]

First, let it be noted that examples (2d) and (2e) do not stand alone; the relative pronoun in (2d) refers back to earlier material, and (2e)

³² Brown and Levinson, *Politeness*, 129.

³³ For an analysis of the scene, see Pakkala-Weckström, *The Dialogue*, 169–170.

begins mid-sentence. Both translators have combined the idea of May's honour (in the preceding line: "and also myn honour" (IV (E) 2189)) with that of the tender flower of her wifhood.

All the English translators appear to have struggled with the rhyme between the second and third lines in this extract. The giving of the flower is present in all of them, though in version (2d) it is a simile rather than a metaphor, but all versions have added line-fillers: (2b) expands with "both safe and sound;" (2c) with "as justly due you;" and (2d) with "for good or ill." The Finnish translation also has an expansion: the idea of passing the flower is expressed in "käteesi kannoin" ('carried to your hands'), but it is followed with "ja sen vaalittavaks annoin" ('and gave it to you to cherish'). This addition, too, has clearly been made for the sake of rhyme ("kannoin"/"annoin").

The reference to the second 'gift,' the physical union of January and May, can be found in all translations, although (2d) changes the focus somewhat by replacing "yow" by "your will." Here the translator may have thought that May might be referring to the fact that as January's wife, she is always at his disposal—as indeed she is. However, that is not what May is saying in the original; she is referring to the actual physical proximity created between them by matrimony, because she is well aware these are exactly the words that January most wants to hear from her lips. The Finnish translation again has an expansion here: "sitoi minut ruumiineeni sinuun" ('bound me with my body to you') is followed by "ja vihki sinut miehekseni" ('and hallowed you to be my husband').

In the *Shipman's Tale*, there is an exchange between husband and wife in which the wife uses the negatively polite address form *sire*; this is perhaps a case that straddles the borderline between polite and impolite, since she ends her turn with a rather strict imperative, "Com doun to-day and lat youre bagges stonde" (VII 220). Nonetheless, I have categorised the use of "sire" in the opening as negative politeness; when it is compared to the two scenes categorised as impolite (below), the difference will become obvious.

(3) What, sire, how longe wol ye faste? (VII 215)

(3b) What, sir, and how long will you fast?

(3c) What, sire, how long then will ye sit there fasting

(3d) "It's me, dear. How much more

Have you to do up there,' she said, 'and fasting?'

(3e) Miten kauan sinä nyt jatkat, hyvä herra, paastoasi?

[How long will you continue, good sir, your fast?]

The negative politeness expressed by the address form "sire" is present in all of the translations save (3d), which uses "dear" instead, changing the challenging tone of the original into a warm and friendly one. The Finnish "hyvä herra" (3e) can be translated as 'sir' or 'good sir.' When the passage is compared to a later exchange between the couple, in which the wife's infidelity is about to be discovered, the importance of the negative politeness token becomes clearer:

(4) Forgyve it me, myn owene spouse deere (VII 425)

(4b) Forgive me, then, my own sweet husband dear

(4c) Forgive me now, my spouse and husband dear

(4d) Forgive me, dearest husband, just this while

(4e) Minulle anteeks anna, ukko oma

[Forgive me, my own old man]

Here, the wife uses a very positive form indeed, the noun "spouse" preceded by two possessives ("myn owene") and followed by the adjective "deere." Translation (4b) follows the original closely, preserving the same structure, but adding the premodifier "sweet;" (4c) uses a complex subject, "spouse and husband," but is otherwise faithful to the original. Version (4d) uses the superlative adjective form "dearest" before "husband" and adds a line-filler ("just this while") to the end of the line. While this addition is perhaps justifiable in terms of the rhythm of the poem, it is nonetheless an unnecessary expansion, something that does not exist in the source text, "no more than a babble to muffle the work's own voice."³⁴ Besides, versions (4b) and (4c) are proof that a closer translation may still preserve the rhythm.

In the Finnish version, (4e), the endearment "ukko oma" ('my own old man') is somewhat more colloquial than the others—perhaps we could even talk about *popularisation*, which is the opposite of *ennoblement*

³⁴ Berman, "Translation," 282.

(Berman 2004: 283)—but it manages to capture the intimate tone of the exchange quite well.³⁵

5.2 *Impoliteness*

In the three tales, there are two exchanges between characters where inherent impoliteness occurs: the first can be found in the *Miller's Tale*, where the heroine, Alison, finds herself caught between two admirers: one of them in her bedroom, the other one outside her window, wooing her. She and her lover have cleverly managed to sidetrack the foolish old husband, but the unplanned appearance of the second suitor threatens to expose them. Therefore, Alison is quite rude to him:

- (5) "Go fro the window, Jakke fool," she sayde;
 "As help me God, it wol nat be 'com pa me.'
 I love another—and elles I were to blame—
 Wel bet than thee, by Jhesu, Absolon.
 Go forth thy wey, or I wol cast a ston,
 And lat me slepe, a twenty devel wey!" (I (A) 3708–3713)

- (5b) "Go from the window, jack-a-napes," she said,
 "For, s'help me God, it is not 'come kiss me.'
 I love another, or to blame I'd be,
 Better than you, by Jesus, Absalom!
 Go on your way, or I'll stone you therefrom,
 And let me sleep, the fiends take you away!"

- (5c) "Go! Leave my window, jackass," she replied.
 It will not be 'Come kiss me' by God's name;
 I love another, or else I were to blame,
 Better than thee, by Jesu, Absalon.
 Be off, or I will stone thee. What! Have done!
 And let me sleep, in the devil's name, I say!"

- (5d) "You go away," she answered, "You Tom-fool!
 There is no come-up-and-kiss-me here for you.
 I love another and why shouldn't I too?
 Better than you, by Jesu, Absalon!
 Take yourself off or I shall throw a stone.
 I want to get some sleep. You go to Hell!"

- (5e) "Pois ikkunasta, senkin hullu!" huusi
 Alison hiljaa. "Korjaa sieltä luusi!
 Jumala paratkoon—vai lempimään
 sinua muka? Siihen häpeään

³⁵ Berman, "Translation," 283.

et minua saa! Toista miestä minä
 rakastan—paljon parempaa kuin sinä...
 Siis mene tiehesi—tai heitän kiven!
 On toki oikeus saada unta hiven...
 Jo painu hornaan, painu kiireen vilkkaa!”
 [“Out of the window, you fool!” shouted
 Alison quietly. “Get your bones out of there!
 By God—is it loving me
 you want? To that shame
 you won’t bring me! Another man I
 love—much better than you...
 So go on your way—or I’ll throw a stone!
 I certainly have the right to a wink of sleep...
 Go to hell, go quickly!”]

This is quite a long passage, and it contains many impolite features. First comes the order to leave combined with name-calling: “Go from the window, Jakke fool.” The order to leave is repeated after three lines, this time combined with a threat: “Go forth thy way, or I wol cast a ston.” Alison also humiliates Absolon by announcing that she loves another much better than him, and finishes with an order intensified with an oath: “lat me slepe, a twenty devel wey!” To sum up the impoliteness strategies used by Alison, there are three orders, one instance of name-calling, one threat, and one instance of scorn.³⁶

The first translation, (5b), follows the original very closely. All six impoliteness features can be found in the translation. However, the oath used to intensify the final order has been changed into “the fiends take you away!” which is a bit stronger than the original oath. The second translation, (5c), adds several elements: in the first line, there are two imperatives, “go” and “leave;” the threat is followed by the interjection “What! Have done!” and the final line ends with a line-filler “I say!” These elements can all be considered unnecessary expansions, and they would also seem to distort the rhythm of the original. The third English translation, (5d), preserves the number of the impoliteness strategies, but changes the content and focus of some of them (“elles I were to blame” has been changed into an interroga-

³⁶ These categories follow Culpeper, “Towards an Anatomy,” 357–358, although excepting his first category, as direct orders need not always be impolite. In addition, Culpeper talks about *frightening*, which he defines as to “instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur” (358). In this context, however, I feel that “threat” works better.

tive "why shouldn't I too?"). Most strikingly, the final imperative has been changed into a statement, "I want to get some sleep," and the following oath has become the imperative: "You go to Hell!"

The Finnish translation has the most expansions. The first line is quite a faithful translation, ordering Absolon to go away from the window, with the name-calling ("pois ikkunasta, senkin hullu," 'get out of the window, you fool'), but, in contrast to the original, the order is repeated in the following line ("korjaa sieltä luusi," roughly translatable as 'get your bones out of there'). The second repetition occurs in the same place as in the original ("siis mene tiehesi," 'so go away'), and is combined with the threat. In this version, as in (5d), the imperative "lat me slepe" has been changed into a statement, "on toki oikeus saada unta hiven" ('I have a right to get some sleep'), and the oath has become the imperative, except the Finnish version is even stronger, because the imperative is repeated: "Jo painu hornaan, painu kiireen vilkkaa!" ('go to hell, go quickly'). There is also an added instance of scorn in the Finnish translation "siihen häpeään et minua saa;" this follows Alison's statement "it wol nat be 'com pa me,'" and translates as 'You won't make me shame myself thus.' This is a particularly unwarranted expansion, with nothing even remotely similar in the source text. All in all, of all the Alisons, the Finnish-speaking one is, if not the rudest, by far the cruellest.

The other scene containing impolite speech is found in the *Merchant's Tale*, when the old husband discovers his wife's unfaithfulness in a particularly cruel way: he has suffered temporary blindness, and suddenly recovers his sight just as she is in the middle of having sex with her lover up a pear-tree. The husband's reaction is outrage, and can certainly be classified as inherent impoliteness:

(6) O stronge lady store, what dostow? (IV (E) 2367)

This utterance is particularly interesting in that, even though it clearly is an insult, it still contains the deferential address form "lady." The use of this negatively polite address form actually adds force to the insult. The deferential address form embedded within the insult is striking compared with the colourful endearments that January had showered upon his beloved wife just moments before: "Rys up, my wyf, my love, my lady free" (IV (E) 2138); "Com forth, my white spouse" (IV (E) 2144); "the creature that I best love" (IV (E) 2161); "trewē, deere wyf" (IV (E) 2164).

The translations vary quite a lot:

(6b) Outlandish, brazen woman, what do you do?

(6c) O bold, bad woman, what is that ye do?

(6d) Strong Madam Strumpet! What are you up to there?

(6e) Voi—rouva Lutka, mitä teetkään siellä?

[O—madam, what are you doing there?]

All translations carry the force of the insult, but only versions (6d) and (6e) preserve the polite address form of the original, having “Madam” and “rouva” (‘madam’), respectively. Versions (6b) and (6c) are thus actually quite different in tone, as well as somewhat softer than the original. Only versions (6c) and the Finnish version (6e) contain the exclamation “o,” which gives further depth to January’s outburst.

The scene continues with May trying to defend herself, explaining that she was merely attempting to cure January’s blindness by struggling with a man in a tree, but January remains unconvinced, and further insulting follows:

(7) “Struggle?” quod he, “Ye, algate in it wente!
God yeve yow bothe on shames deth to dyen!
He swyved thee; I saugh it with myne yen,
And elles I be hanged by the hals!” (IV (E) 2376–2379)

(7b) “Struggle!” cried he, “but damme, in it went!
God give you both a shameful death to die!
He banged you, for I saw it with my eye,
Or they may hang me by the neck up, else!”

(7c) “Struggle!” he cried. “I saw it going in!
God give you both a shameful death to die!
He laid thee—yea, I saw it with mine eye,
Let them go hang me if it not be true!”

(7d) “Struggle!” he said. “I saw you! In it went!
A shameful death to both of you! What lies!
I saw him have you, saw it with these eyes,
And if I didn’t, hang me by the neck!”

(7e) “Vai painiskelu! Sisäänhän se meni!”
kivahti mies. “Sen omin silmineni
näin selvästi—tai hirttää minut saa!

Sinuthan maattiin! Siksi uskokaa:
 Jumalan nimeen ette kuolemaa
 te vältä kumpikaan ja häpeää!”
 [“Struggling! It went inside!”
 snapped the man. “With my own eyes
 I saw it clearly—or you may hang me!
 You were laid! Therefore believe it:
 in God’s name you shall not death
 avoid, either of you, or shame!”]

January’s speech contains two clearly impolite features: the wishing of a “shames deth” by the hand of God on both his wife and her lover, and the rude expression “he swyved thee,” which again is very different in tone from his earlier, euphemistic references to (his own) sexual activities with May (e.g., “it is no fors how longe that we pleye” IV (E) 1835). All the English translations have preserved the first strategy quite faithfully, although (7d) omits the mention of God and instead adds the exclamation “what lies!” to the line, obviously for the sake of rhyme; similarly, in the previous line, the “I saw you” is an unnecessary expansion, as is the “I saw” at the beginning of the next line. The Finnish translation, (7e), has taken some liberties, firstly in the order—here, e.g., the hanging precedes the banging—but also by means of expansion: “siksi uskokaa:/ Jumalan nimeen ette kuolemaa/ te vältä kumpikaan ja häpeää!” (‘So believe me: in the name of God, you shall neither of you avoid shame and death’). The ‘believe me’ is an expansion not found in the original, and God is no longer the punisher.

The taboo word has been toned down in versions (7c), (7d), and (7e)—the Finnish “sinuthan maattiin” is roughly equivalent to (7c), ‘he laid thee,’ although the Finnish is in the passive voice, and thus perhaps even less explicit than the (7c). Of all the translations, (7b) comes closest to the tone of the original. In Berman’s terms, it could be argued that translations (7c), (7d), and (7e) have all been subject to ennoblement.³⁷ It is, however, worth noticing that all translations quite faithfully retain the “in it wente” in the first line of the extract.

³⁷ Interestingly, Nevill Coghill, *The Canterbury Tales*, 18, declares in the introduction to his translation (version d) that “My translation is unexpurgated; the barbarous and (one is almost tempted to say) hypocritical practice of Victorian times in the matter of expurgation has lapsed in our lifetime, and what our greatest authors chose to mean and write need no longer be obscured by dashes, gaps and asterisks.”

6. *Discussion and conclusions*

Through this selection of examples containing politeness/impoliteness features, we can see that the subtle power devices at work here have largely gone unnoticed by the translators; sometimes they have disappeared altogether, as is the case with the negative politeness forms “sire” in translation (3d) and “lady” in translations (6b) and (6c). I suggest two different explanations for this: firstly, scholars have only been paying attention to such detail since the emergence of research into pragmatics, and secondly, translation theory as we now know it was unknown to the translators. Either way, with regard to the power shifts in the dialogue, the final product of the translation process is, in all four translations, somewhat flawed—or *deformed*, in Berman’s terms—due to this oversight.³⁸ Recognition of the instances in which the balance of intimate power is disturbed can play an important role in understanding the story.

One important aspect of Chaucer’s power play is already lost in translation: the variation in the use of the second person pronouns “ye” and “thou.”³⁹ Although Hill, the translator of the English version (c), has preserved the forms, his use of “thou” is archaic, and may well have a foreignising effect.⁴⁰ In the Finnish examples, there is no variation in the pronouns of address either, though the more formal pronoun *te* might actually have fitted the context of example 3e quite nicely.

Not surprisingly, the Finnish translation seems to take the most liberties with the source text; these liberties are usually in the form of expansions, sometimes by repetition, as in (5e), sometimes simply by inventing expressions that fit the general context, as in (2e) or (7e), for example. As noted earlier, the two languages differ substantially in both syntax and vocabulary, so obviously a close translation and a verse translation are more or less mutually exclusive.

In his *Translating Poetry*, André Lefevre distinguishes between seven different strategies in literary translation, or more specifically the translation of poetry: phonemic translation; literal translation; metri-

³⁸ “Translation,” 278.

³⁹ See, e.g., David Burnley, *The Language of Chaucer* (Basingstoke and London: MacMillan, 1989), 18–22 and Pakkala-Weckström, *The Dialogue*, 205–207.

⁴⁰ Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London: Routledge, 1995), 35.

cal translation; poetry into prose; rhyme; blank verse; and interpretation, which is further divided into version and imitation.⁴¹ Based on the fact that the translation is, in fact, only a selection, as well as on my analysis of the examples discussed above, I would identify Toivo Lyy's translation more as a version than anything else. According to Lefevre, "the writer of versions basically keeps the substance of the source text, but changes its form."⁴² A version is compressed in some places, expanded in others; this too is characteristic of the Finnish translation.⁴³

Of the English translation examples, there are only two which actually change the tone of the original: (1c), in which a plea has become an order, and (3d), in which a negatively polite address form has been replaced by a positively polite one. In other cases, we can perhaps talk about changing nuances, as in (7c) and (7d), in which "swyved" has become "laid" and "had," respectively.

Even though the main focus of this paper has been on the translation of politeness features, some additional observations on the translations are also warranted. The English translations, obviously all aiming to preserve the metrical form of the poem, sometimes struggle with the rhyme scheme, which tends to result in numerous more or less unnecessary additions; this is particularly the case with example (2). Based on this limited survey, of the English translations, version (b), translated by J. U. Nicholson would seem to be most faithful overall to the original. Nevill Coghill's 1951 translation (version (d)) is the least so; he tends to expand and ennoble even where the rhyme scheme would allow a closer translation. Version (c), by Frank Ernest Hill, falls in between these two in terms of faithfulness to Chaucer's verse.

⁴¹ André Lefevre, *Translating Poetry. Seven Strategies and a Blueprint* (Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1975), 4–5; 76.

⁴² *Translating*, 76.

⁴³ *Translating*, 78.

Works Cited

Primary sources

- Chaucer, Geoffrey. 1934. *The Canterbury Tales*. Trans. J. U. Nicholson. Garden City, New York: Garden City Publishing Company.
- . 1935. *The Canterbury Tales*. Trans. Frank Ernest Hill. New York: David McKay Company.
- . 1951. *The Canterbury Tales*. Trans. Nevill Coghill. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- . 1975. *Canterburyn tarinoita*. Trans. Toivo Lyy. Porvoo: WSOY.
- . 1987. *The Riverside Chaucer*. Ed. Larry Benson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Secondary sources

- Berman, Antoine. 2004. Translation and the Trials of the Foreign. Trans. Lawrence Venuti. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 2nd ed., 276–289. London: Routledge.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burnley, David. 1989. *The Language of Chaucer*. Basingstoke: MacMillan.
- Coghill, Nevill. 1951. Introduction. In *The Canterbury Tales*, by Geoffrey Chaucer, trans. Nevill Coghill. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 1996. Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 349–367.
- Eelen, Gino. 2001. *Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Helin, Irmeli. 2005. Kääntäjä ja yhteiskunta—uudelleenääntämisen yhteiskunnallinen viitekehys. In *Kielen matkassa multimediaan. Näkökulmia kääntämisen tutkimiseen ja opiskelemiseen*, ed. Hilikka Yli-Jokipii, 145–164. University of Helsinki Publications of the Department of Translation Studies 1. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Hill, Frank Ernest. 1935. Introduction. In *The Canterbury Tales*, by Geoffrey Chaucer, trans. Frank Ernest Hill. New York: David McKay Company.
- Hussey, S. S. 1971. *Chaucer: An Introduction*. London: Methuen and Co.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1966. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In *On Translation*, ed. R. A. Brower, 232–239. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jucker, Andreas. 2000. Slanders, Slurs and Insults on the Road to Canterbury: Forms of Verbal Aggression in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. In *Placing Middle English in Context*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Päivi Pahta and Matti Rissanen, 369–389. Topics in English Linguistics 35. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jucker, Andreas H. and Irma Taavitsainen. 2003. Introduction. In *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas H. Jucker, 1–25. Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lefevre, André. 1975. *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint*. Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.
- Lyy, Toivo. 1975. Suomentajan alkusanat. In *Canterburyn tarinoita*, by Geoffrey Chaucer, trans. Toivo Lyy. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Mills, Sara. 2003. *Gender and Politeness*, Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Munday, Jerome. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Nicholson, J. U. 1934. Apologia. In *The Canterbury Tales*, by Geoffrey Chaucer, trans. J. U. Nicholson. Garden City, New York: Garden City Publishing Company.

- Pakkala-Weckström, Mari. 2005. *The Dialogue of Love, Marriage and Maistrie in Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*. Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique 67. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Paloposki, Outi. 2004. Kääntäminen historiassa. In *Alussa oli käännös*, ed. Riitta Oittinen and Pirjo Mäkinen 349–373. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Pearsall, Derek. 1986. The Canterbury Tales II: Comedy. In *The Cambridge Chaucer Companion*, ed. Piero Boitani and Jill Mann, 125–142. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Watts, Richard J. 1991. *Power in Family Discourse*, Contributions to the Sociology of Language 63. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

INDEX

- Acca, bishop of Hexham 127
 Acts of the Apostles: see Pentecost
 miracle; Bible
 Ælfric, abbot of Eynsham 8–9, 11,
 18–19, 21–22, 24–25, 57–58, 186, 193,
 253, 268, 274, 284
 Æthelweard, ealdorman 11, 24, 28–29
 Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester 8–9,
 11, 18–19
 Agilberht, bishop of the West Saxons
 43–45, 62
 Agriculture 244–245
 Aidan, bishop of Lindisfarne 63–64
 Albinus, grammarian 90
 Album registrum: see London, British
 Library Additional 14847
 Alcuin of York 2 n. 2, 11, 95, 125
 n. 93, 127–128
 Aldfrith, king of the Northumbrians
 41, 64
Aldhelm Poem 20–21
 Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne 6, 11,
 30, 59, 82, 88–91, 94, 96–97, 122
 n. 82, 218; see also *Aldhelm Poem*; *De*
 metris; *Carmen de virginitate*
 Alfred, King of the West Saxons 6–7,
 11, 14, 15, 275; (see also Alfredian
 translations)
 Alfredian translations 7, 11–12, 27, 29,
 253, 274, 277–279, 284
 Alliteration 20, 29–31, 315
 Ambrose, saint 23, 104, 107, 121
And as conditional: *and if* 290–291,
 294–300, 302, 304; development
 291–294; origins 289–290, 293
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 11, 28–29, 191
 Angrboða 222
Annals of Quintus Ennius: see Quintus
 Ennius
 Asser, bishop of St Davids 28
 Athanasius of Alexandria: see *Vita*
 sancti Antonii
 Audax, grammarian 90, 94, 96
 Augustine of Hippo 107
 Augustine, archbishop of Canterbury
 4, 51–52
 Baldwin, abbot of Bury St Edmunds
 160–162
 Barking 126
 Basic colour terms: definition 231–233,
 239–240; sequence of acquisition x,
 231, 235–236, 240
Battle of Maldon, The 29
 Bede: see *Historia ecclesiastica gentis*
 Anglorum; *Epistola ad Ecgberhtum*
 episcopum; *Vita Cuthberti*; *De arte*
 metrica; *Vita sancti Felicis*; *Epistola*
 de obitu Bedae; *Bede's Death*
 Song
Bede's Death Song 22–23
 Begu, nun of Hackness 128
 Benedict, saint 119
Beodricesworth 160
Beowulf 29, 73, 213
 Bertulf, abbot of Bobbio 113
 Bible 9, 46, 103–104, 109, 115, 128
 n. 109, 130, 309
 Birdswald 141
 Black 236–237, 242, 248, 252, 257–259,
 261, 263
Blæwen: see blue
Bleu: see blue
 Blue x, 235 n. 9, 237, 244 n. 29, 246,
 254–256, 259–261, 263
 Boniface, archbishop of Mainz 55
 Bradley, Henry 186–188
 Brittonic: influence on English viii, 293,
 298, 304; status in England 41–43,
 64–71
 Brown x, 240 n. 21, 248, 251, 256–259,
 261, 263
Brun: see brown
 Bury St Edmunds: demographics 157,
 160; history ix, 147–148, 157,
 180
 Byrhtferth of Ramsey 25 n. 3, 217

Cædmon's Hymn 227
 Caelin: see Ceawlin
 Caelius Sedulius 93
 Cambridge, University Library Ee. 3. 60
 168

- Cambridge, University Library Ff. 2. 33
 154 n. 21, 157–159, 167–169
- Candidus of Fulda 95
- Canterbury Tales, The*, translations
 of: see Nicholson, U. J.; Hill, Frank
 Ernest; Coghill, Nevill; Lyy, Toivo
- Carmen ad Deum* 30–31
- Carmen de virginitate* 30, 91, 122 n. 82,
- Cartularies 157–158
- Cassian, John 105–106
- Catullus 85
- Ceawlin, king of the West Saxons 62
- Cedd, bishop of the East Saxons 43,
 45, 47–48
- Celtic: see Brittonic, Irish, Pictish
- Cenwealh, king of the West Saxons 45,
 62–63
- Ceolfred, abbot of Jarrow and of
 Wearmouth 54
- Charters 7, 13, 18, 149, 151–155,
 168–169, 190–191, 215, 253; (see also
 cartularies)
- Chrysarius 119
- Clergy (demographics of) 2, 4–6, 9,
 11–15, 22, 24, 31, 73, 163–167
- Clerk's Tale, The* 311
- Code alternation viii, 21, 24
- Code-switching viii, 16–21, 24
- Coghill, Nevill 308, 310–311, 314, 325
- Columbanus, saint 113
- Conditional clauses 294–295, 298–302;
 (see also *and* as conditional)
- Confessio amantis* 276
- Contact: see language-contact
- Conversion 4, 52, 219, 252
- Corpus of Middle English Prose and
 Verse* 270
- Corpus-building 267–272
- Cumbric: see Brittonic
- Cuthbert, saint, bishop of
 Lindisfarne 17, 23, 40 n. 11,
 122–123, 128–129
- Dalreudini* 66
- De arte metrica* ix, 89, 91, 96
- De cultura hortorum*: see Walafrid
 Strabo
- De metris* ix, 59, 89–91
- De miraculis sancti Eadmundi* 162
- De visionibus Wettini*: see Walafrid
 Strabo
- Deo gracias* 277
- Destruction of Troy* 276
- Deusdedit, archbishop of Canterbury 5
- Dialogi* of Gregory the Great:
 Latin 111–112, 118–120, 121, 129;
 Old English 27, 208 n. 11, 277, 284
- Dictionary of Old English* vii, x, 18, 25,
 182–190, 256, 267, 290
- Dictionary of Old English Corpus* 185,
 267, 269–273
- Dictionary of the English Language*: see
 Samuel Johnson
- Discernment of spirits 106–107, 130
- Domesday Book(s) 3, 12, 15, 149, 155
- Dreams ix, 99–109, 111, 115, 117–119,
 121, 126, 128–131
- Durham Proverbs* 197
- Ealdred, Archbishop of York 143–144
- East Anglian: see Old English
- Eberulf, saint 116
- Ecgbert, bishop of York 56–57, 63
- Edmund, saint 161–162, 165, 169
- Edwin, king of the Northumbrians
 125–126, 203
- Elli 225
- Emotional communities 99–100, 101
 n. 5
- Enchiridion* of Byrhtferth: see Byrhtferth
 of Ramsey
- Epistola ad Ecgbertum episcopum* 47
- Epistola de obitu Bedae* 22
- Ethnicity 10, 60–62
- Eugendus, saint 111
- Evagrius Ponticus 105
- Evagrius: see *Vita sancti Antonii*
- Face 312–313
- Fæc* 204, 208–211, 217–219
- Fear 103–104, 106, 108–109, 111,
 114–121, 124–126, 128–131
- Felix, saint, of Crowland: see *Vita sancti
 Guthlaci*
- Fenrir 222–225
- Fifth-foot spondee 81–82
- Finan, bishop of Lindisfarne 48
- Findan, saint, of Rheinau 48
- Fire 225, 241–242, 248, 251, 258
- Franklin's Tale, The* 311
- Fyrst* 204, 208, 210–215, 217
- gân*: see *go*
- gangan*: see *go*
- Garmr 224
- Gealu*: see yellow
- Gemynd*: see mind
- Genesis A* 227

- Germanic x, 150, 212, 213, 218–219,
 249–252, 255–256
Germanus 56–58
go 187–192, 320
Gododdin, Y 73
Gospel of Nicodemus 275–276
Gothic 216, 250, 275
Græg: see grey
gramfærnyrs x, 184, 192–194, 199
 Great Chesters 141
 Greek: in Anglo-Saxon England 5–6,
 20–21, 55, 82, 96; poetic traditions
 ix, 21, 82–88
 Green x, 187, 235, 237, 240, 243–247,
 249–250, 252, 259, 261, 263
 Gregory of Tours 115–118, 121, 125,
 129
 Gregory the Great 108–109; (see also
Liber beatae Gregorii papae; Dialogi;
Moralia in Job)
 Gregory, saint, of Utrecht 55
Grene: see green
 Grey x, 187, 246, 250–252, 255–256,
 259, 261, 263
 Grue 243–245, 247
- Hadrian, abbot 5
Hæwen: see blue
Hawe: see grey
 Heiric of Auxerre 95
 Hel 222–223
Helsinki Corpus of English Texts
 268–272, 275, 296
 Helsinki, University of vii, xi, 37
 Hermann: see *De miraculis sancti*
Eadmundi
 Hermeneutic style 8, 21
 Hesiod 84
 Hexameter ix, 81–97
 Hild, abbess of Whitby 43, 128
 Hill, Frank Ernest 308, 325
Historia abbatum 54
Historia ecclesiastica gentis
Anglorum viii, 4–6, 38–41, 71–72,
 124–129, 131, 203, 219, 226–227,
 284
 Honorius, archbishop of
 Canterbury 4–5
 Horace 87
 Hugl 225
 Humours 181
Hwil 204, 208, 210–211, 215–218
Hwit: see white
 Hymir 223
- Impoliteness xi, 308, 313–314, 319
 Indo-European: lexis 28, 213–214,
 245–251, 255, 258; spread 10, 82, 245
 Inscriptions ix, 39, 41, 56, 81, 139–144
Instructions for Christians 194, 198–199
 Irish viii, 4, 40 n. 11, 41–42, 44, 48–49,
 54, 62–73, 293
 Ithamar, bishop of Rochester 5
- Jocelin of Brakelond 176
 Johnson, Samuel 179–182, 192,
 199–200
 Julian, saint 117
 Juvenal 87
 Juvencus 92
- Kentish: see Old English
 Kirkdale dedication inscription ix,
 139–144
- Lactantius 104
 Lancaster 141
 Langres 54–55
 Language-contact theory 1–2, 9–12,
 15–16
 Latin: as language of the *Latini* 47, 62;
 grammar 7, 13, 18–19, 25, 27, 150,
 308; in Britain viii, 3, 38, 50, 56, 59,
 71–72; influence on Old English viii,
 3, 26–31; loans into Old English 10,
 25–26; oral competence 2, 32, 50
 pronunciation 32 n. 16, 42, 57–58, 61,
 72; vowel-length 57, 58 n. 68, 87–88
 Laurentius, archbishop of
 Canterbury 125
 Lexicography 179–188, 183 n. 17,
 199–200 202, 208 n. 11, 228
Liber beatae Gregorii papae 53,
 125–126
Lindisfarne Gospels 17–18, 268
Literature Online 270
 Logi 225,
 Loki 222, 225
 London, British Library Additional
 14847 157–159, 167
 London, British Library, Cotton
 Cleopatra B. xiii 52
 Lucan 87
 Lucretius 85 n. 12, 86–87, 90 n. 36
 Lyy, Toivo 308, 314, 325
- Macaronic poetry 19–21
 Martin, saint 88, 115–116
Memorie 282

- Merchant's Tale, The* xi, 307, 314, 316, 321
- Metaphor x, 203, 207, 219, 226–227, 238–239, 317
- Middle English: lexis 168–169, 279–285, 290–291; pronouns 324
- Middle English Compendium* x, 270
- Miðgarðsormr 222–226
- Miller's Tale, The* xi, 307, 313 n. 24, 314, 319
- Mind*: basic meanings 272–273, 282–286; semantic change 277–282
- Minde*: see mind
- Monk's Tale, The* 311
- Mood*: basic meanings 272–273, 282–286; semantic change 277–282
- Moralia in Job* 53
- Murray, James 182, 187–188
- Mythology, Old Norse 219–226
- Names: see place-names; personal names
- Nectan, king in Pictland 54
- Negotiation viii, 26–29
- Nicholson, U. J. 308–309, 325
- Northwold Register 158–159, 169
- Nostratic 241–243
- Octovian* 276
- Óðinn 221, 224
- Odyssey* 83
- Old English: Anglian 152; East Anglian ix, 147, 151, 156–157, 169–170; grammar 10, 26–28, 149–150; influence on Latin 8–31; Kentish 148, 150, 152, 169; lexis 3, 10, 168, 250–261, 272–285; origins 3–4, 37–39, 147, 249; West Saxon 8, 16, 62–63, 148, 152, 154 n. 21, 208; written standards 8, 148, 149, 151
- Orange x, 236, 240, 248, 255 n. 55, 259, 262–263
- Origen 105
- Orm Gamalsson 140, 142–143
- Orosius*, Old English translation 29
- Oswald, king of the Northumbrians 8, 63
- Oswine, king of the Deirans 64, 126
- Oswiu, king of the Northumbrians 41, 45, 48, 64
- Oxford English Dictionary* 180–183, 186–190, 199
- Paris Psalter* 190
- Parson's Tale, The* 311
- Passio Praiecti* 120–121
- Pastoral Care* 7, 11–12, 193
- Paulinus of Nola 92
- p-Celtic: see Brittonic, Pictish
- Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English* xi, 289, 294, 301
- Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English* xi, 289, 294, 296
- Pentecost miracle 44–46, 53, 62, 64
- Personal names 59, 66, 67, 149, 153–153, 156, 163–166, 171–175
- Phoenix* 19–20
- Pictish 37, 41–42, 49, 54, 69–71
- Pinchbeck, Walter 168–169
- Pink x, 240 n. 21, 248, 255 n. 55, 259, 262–263
- Place-names viii, 18, 39–41, 51, 60, 65–73, 149, 151, 154, 163, 171–175, 253–254
- Politeness theory xi, 307–308, 311–113
- Population 12–16, 160, 163–167
- Prioress's Tale, The* 311
- Prototype theory 231, 235–236, 263, 272 n. 17
- Prudentius 87, 92–93
- Purple x, 30, 240 n. 21, 248, 257–259, 262–263
- Quintus Ennius 83–85, 87, 96
- Rædwald, king of the East Angles 125
- Ragnarøk 221–225
- Ramsey 9
- Read*: see red
- Red 233, 235, 239–240, 244 n. 29, 248, 251–252, 257, 261–263
- Reform, monastic 8–9
- Regularis concordia* 9, 26–27
- Relict forms 159, 167–169
- Remembraunce* 282
- Repertoire 159, 167–170
- Ripon 73
- Rochester 4–6
- Roman Britain 38, 60, 141–142
- Romanesque architecture 143–144
- Rushworth Gospels* 17, 268
- Ruthwell Cross 73, 139
- Second Nun's Tale, The* 311
- Shipman's Tale, The* xi, 307, 313 n. 24, 314, 317
- siþgearu* x, 184, 194–199
- Snorra Edda* 221

- Snorri Sturluson: see *Snorra Edda*
Spiritus Guydonis 275–276
 Spondee: see fifth-foot spondee
 Square miniscule 8
 Statius 87
 Stoke-by-Nayland 155
 Sulpicius Severus: see *Vita sancti Martini*
Summons to Prayer, A 19–21
 Sweart: see black

Tale of Melibee, The 311
 Tertullian 104
The Ruin 226
The Wanderer 226
 Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury 5
 Þjalfi 225
 Þórr 223–225
 Time: as space 203, 207, 211–213, 215, 219, 222, 226–227; cyclical 205–207, 221, 225; figurative 205–207; in medieval culture 205–207; in medieval Scandinavia 219–226; linear 205–207, 214, 221; Old English lexis of 207–211
 Translation: deforming tendencies 308, 315, 324; metre 324–325; retranslation 309
 Týr 224

 Understatement 183, 197–199
 Urðarbrunnr 220
Use of Confessors 193
 Útgarða-Loki 193

 Valerius Flaccus 87
 Valhöll 226
 Venantius Fortunatus 88, 96
 Vergil 82, 86–87, 94–95
Veröld 222
Versus de patribus: see Alcuin of York
 Víðarr 224
 vikings 6

 Visions ix, 100–103, 107–116, 118–122, 124–131
Vita Aegili: see Candidus of Fulda
Vita Æthelwoldi: see Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester
Vita patrum Iurensium 111
Vita sancti Antonii 106–107, 110, 123–124, 130
Vita sancti Columbani 112–113
Vita sancti Dunstani 52
Vita sancti Felicis 127
Vita sancti Galli confessoris: see Walahfrid Strabo
Vita sancti Germani: see Heiric of Auxerre
Vita sancti Guthlaci 64–65, 73, 123–124, 128
Vita sancti Iohannis Reomaensis 112–113
Vita sancti Martini 88, 110–111
Vita Wandregiseli abbatis Fontanellensis 113, 126–128
Vita Wilfridi 43–45, 55, 73, 126–128
Vitae Cuthberti 51, 68, 123–124
Völuspá 224

 Wæden: see blue
 Walahfrid Strabo 95
 Welsh: see Brittonic
Weorold 222
 Whitby, synod of 42–48, 53, 63–64
 White 235–237, 248, 252, 255, 261, 263
 Wilfrid, bishop of York 43–46, 55, 73, 126–128
 Wills: see charters
Works and Days: see Hesiod
 Wulfstan, Archbishop of York 8, 11, 24, 209, 217, 253, 268

 Yellow 235, 237 n. 14, 240, 243–248, 252, 259, 261, 263
 Yggdrasil 220, 225–226
 Ymir 221–223, 226

THE NORTHERN WORLD

NORTH EUROPE AND THE BALTIC C. 400-1700 AD
PEOPLES, ECONOMIES AND CULTURES

Editors

Barbara Crawford (St. Andrews)
David Kirby (London)
Jon-Vidar Sigurdsson (Oslo)
Ingvild øye (Bergen)
Richard W. Unger (Vancouver)
Piotr Gorecki (University of California at Riverside)

ISSN: 1569-1462

This series provides an opportunity for the publication of scholarly studies concerning the culture, economy and society of northern lands from the early medieval to the early modern period. The aims and scope are broad and scholarly contributions on a wide range of disciplines are included: all historical subjects, every branch of archaeology, saga studies, language topics including place-names, art history and architecture, sculpture and numismatics.

1. Schutz, H. *Tools, Weapons and Ornaments*. Germanic Material Culture in Pre-Carolingian Central Europe, 400-750. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12298 2
2. Biggs, D., S.D. Michalove and A. Compton Reeves (eds.). *Traditions and Transformations in late Medieval England*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12341 5
3. Tielhof, M. van. *The 'Mother of all Trades'*. The Baltic Grain Trade in Amsterdam from the Late 16th to the Early 19th Century. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12546 9
4. Looijenga, T. *Texts & Contexts of the Oldest Runic Inscriptions*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12396 2
5. Grosjean, A. *An Unofficial Alliance*. Scotland and Sweden 1569-1654. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13241 4
6. Tanner, H.J. *Families, Friends and Allies*. Boulogne and Politics in Northern France and England, c. 879-1160. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13243 0
7. Finlay, A. *Fagrskinna, A Catalogue of the Kings of Norway*. A Translation with Introduction and Notes. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13172 8
8. Biggs, D.L., S.D. Michalove and A. Compton Reeves (eds.). *Reputation and Representation in Fifteenth-Century Europe*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13613 4
9. Etting, V. *Queen Margrete I (1353-1412) and the Founding of the Nordic Union*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13652 5
10. Lockhart, P.D. *Frederik II and the Protestant Cause*. Denmark's Role in the Wars of Religion, 1559-1596. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13790 4
11. Williams, G. and P. Bibire. *Sagas, Saints and Settlements*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13807 2
12. Duczko, W. *Viking Rus*. Studies on the Presence of Scandinavians in Eastern Europe. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13874 9

13. Kotilaine, J.T. *Russia's Foreign Trade and Economic Expansion in the Seventeenth Century*. Windows on the World. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13896 X
14. Harreld, D.J. *High Germans in the Low Countries*. German Merchants and Commerce in Golden Age Antwerp. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14104 9
15. Blomkvist, N. *The Discovery of the Baltic*. The Reception of a Catholic World-system in the European North (AD 1075-1225). 2005. ISBN 90 04 14122 7
16. Oram, R.D. (ed.). *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214-49*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14206 1
17. Boulhosa, P.P. *Icelanders and the Kings of Norway*. Medieval Sagas and Legal Texts. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14516 8
18. Murdoch, S. *Network North*. Scottish Kin, Commercial and Covert Associations in Northern Europe, 1603-1746. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14664 4
19. Cook, B. and G. Williams (eds.). *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500-1250*. Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14777 2
20. Cathcart, A. *Kinship and Clientage*. Highland Clanship 1451-1609. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15045 4
21. Isoaho, M. *The Image of Aleksandr Nevskiy in Medieval Russia*. Warrior and Saint. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15101 7
22. Te Brake, W. and W. Klooster (eds.). *Power and the City in the Netherlandic World*. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15129 1
23. Stewart, L.A.M. *Urban Politics and the British Civil Wars*. Edinburgh, 1617-53. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15167 3
24. Burgess, G.S. and C. Strijbosch (eds.). *The Brendan Legend*. Texts and Versions. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15247 2
25. Bellamy, M. *Christian IV and his Navy*. A Political and Administrative History of the Danish Navy 1596-1648. 2006. ISBN 978 90 04 15450 6
26. Fonnesberg-Schmidt, I. *The Popes and the Baltic Crusades 1147-1254*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 15502 2
27. Line, P. *Kingship and State Formation in Sweden 1130-1290*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 15578 7
28. Fudge, J.D. *Commerce and Print in the Early Reformation*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 15662 3
29. Antonsson, H. *St. Magnús of Orkney*. A Scandinavian Martyr-Cult in Context. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 15580 0
30. Jensen, J.M. *Denmark and the Crusades, 1400-1650*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 15579 4
31. Ballin Smith, B., S. Taylor and G. Williams (eds.). *West over Sea*. Studies in Scandinavian Sea-Borne Expansion and Settlement Before 1300. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 15893 1
32. De Bruyn Kops, H. *A Spirited Exchange*. The Wine and Brandy Trade between France and the Dutch Republic in its Atlantic Framework, 1600-1650. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16074 3
33. Roslund, M. *Guests in the House*. Cultural Transmission between Slavs and Scandinavians 900 to 1300 AD. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16189 4
34. Hybel, N. and B. Poulsen. *Danish Resources c. 1000-1550*. Growth and Recession. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16192 4
35. Szabo, V.E. *Monstrous Fishes and the Mead-Dark Sea*. Whaling in the Medieval North Atlantic. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16398 0

36. Bes, L., E. Frankot and H. Brand. *Baltic Connections*. Archival Guide to the Maritime Relations of the Countries around the Baltic Sea (including the Netherlands) 1450-1800. 3 vols. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16429 1 (set)
37. Unger, R. *Britain and Poland-Lithuania*. Contact and Comparison from the Middle Ages to 1795. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16623 3
38. Orning, H.J. *Unpredictability and Presence*. Norwegian Kingship in the High Middle Ages. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16661 5
39. Mackley, J.S. *The Legend of St Brendan*. A Comparative Study of the Latin and Anglo-Norman Versions. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16662 2
40. Bolton, T. *The Empire of Cnut the Great*. Conquest and the Consolidation of Power in Northern Europe in the Early Eleventh Century. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16670 7
41. Sicking, L. and D. Abreu-Ferreira (eds.). *Beyond the Catch*. Fisheries of the North Atlantic, the North Sea and the Baltic, 900-1850. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 16973 9
42. Lewis-Simpson, S. (ed.). *Youth and Age in the Medieval North*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 17073 5
43. Korpiola, M. *Between Betrothal and Bedding*. Marriage Formation in Sweden 1200-1600. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17329 3
44. Riisøy, A.I. *Sexuality, Law and Legal Practice and the Reformation in Norway*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17364 4
45. Wyatt, D. *Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800-1200*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17533 4
46. Glete, J. *Swedish Naval Administration, 1521-1721*. Resource Flows and Organisational Capabilities. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 17916 5
47. Worthington, D. (ed.). *British and Irish Emigrants and Exiles in Europe, 1603-1688*. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18008 6
48. Hall, A., O. Timofeeva, Á. Kiricsi and B. Fox (eds.). *Interfaces between Language and Culture in Medieval England*. A Festschrift for Matti Kilpiö. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18011 6

